DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 774 SP 033 666

AUTHOR Neufeld, Barbara; Boris-Schacter, Sheryl
TITLE Professional Development Schools in Massachusetts: Maintenance and Growth.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning, Boston.
SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y. Education and Research Div.
PUB DATE Jun 91
NOTE 102p.; For a related document, see ED 341 649.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Collegiality; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Implementation; School Organization; *Student Teachers; Student Teacher Supervisors
IDENTIFIERS *Experienced Teachers; Massachusetts; *Professional Development Schools

ABSTRACT

This report focuses on three professional development school (PDS) programs in Massachusetts. The PDS collaborative programs involve the following partners: East Longmeadow High School and University of Massachusetts at Amherst; Devotion School (Brookline) and Wheelock College; and Coolidge Elementary School (Shrewsbury) and Anna Maria College. Descriptions are given of each program, followed by a discussion of issues associated with: (1) developing and implementing the teacher education content of the PDS programs; (2) expanding the number of participating schools and individuals; and (3) developing the organizational and management capacities necessary to sustain the programs. The report emphasizes that none of the programs described could as yet be considered an actual PDS because of the limited impact each has had on the total school structure and operation. (IAH)

***********************************************************************
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
***********************************************************************

ED342774

Center for Teaching and Learning

# Professional Development Schools in Massachusetts

## Maintenance and Growth

SP 033 666

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Karen O'Connor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

---

- ● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

# PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS IN MASSACHUSETTS: MAINTENANCE AND GROWTH

Barbara Neufeld

with

Sheryl Boris-Schacter

June 1991

Education Matters, Inc.
Cambridge, MA

This project was made possible by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

Copyright c 1991 by the Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning.

No part of this publication may be reproduced without written consent from the Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**INTRODUCTION**..........1
Organization of the Report..........5

**THE PROGRAMS**..........6
The Calvin Coolidge School/Anna Maria College Professional Development School..........6
East Longmeadow High School and the Academic Disciplines: Teacher Education Program of the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst..........9
The Learning/Teaching Collaborative: Boston and Brookline Public Schools, Wheelock and Simmons Colleges..........12
Considerations Across the Programs..........15

**THE PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION COMPONENT: DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING PROGRAM CONTENT**..........18
Influences on Program Content..........18
Implementing the Program Content..........31
Impact on Teacher Education..........36
Impact on Teachers..........40
Impact on College Faculty..........44
Impact on Public School Students..........46
Summary..........49

**EXPANDING PARTICIPATION**..........51
Selecting Participants Within the Schools and Colleges..........53
    Selecting Teachers..........54
    The College's Role in Teacher Selection..........60
    Selecting Student Teachers..........63
    Selecting College Supervisors..........65
Summary:
    Expansion, Selection and Participation Issues..........68

**ISSUES OF ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT**..........74
Formal Structural Components..........74
Organizational Issues Involving Time..........79
Implications for the Future..........82
    Issues of Funding..........83
    Key Individuals: Not Just Roles..........84
    PDS Programs or Schools?..........86
    What Next?..........89

**REFERENCES**..........94

**APPENDIX A:**
Program Addresses..........95

**APPENDIX B:**
Education Matters, Inc.
The Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning..........96

# INTRODUCTION

Since 1987 a number of public elementary and secondary schools across Massachusetts have been collaborating with local colleges to create Professional Development School (PDS) opportunities for pre-service and experienced teachers. The PDS, a collaboration between at least one teacher preparation program and one school, is "designed to improve the nature of the school-based experiences available to future and novice teachers and the skill with which veteran teachers work with them" (Neufeld & Haavind, 1988, p. 1). The collaborations aim to increase the role of experienced classroom teachers in formal teacher education and to create schools in which it will be possible to:

> * test new models of professional education that are jointly designed and administered by school based practitioners and college faculty; and
>
> * provide a significant number of prospective teachers, novice teachers, and experienced teachers with high-quality training under the guidance of some of the Commonwealth's most able teachers. (Leading the Way, 1987)

In 1988, we described the collaborative efforts of the first six schools and their first years of PDS activity. We focused on beginning the process of collaboration and program development. After noting the complexity of the enterprises and the amount of time and effort required to get them functioning, we concluded with some comments about the positive response that teachers and college faculty had to their involvement with the PDS collaborations. We wrote:

> Teachers and college faculty...are enthusiastic about their programs and eager to continue.....As a result of their programs, more attention has been showered on the purpose, content and organization of the field component of pre-service teacher education. Public school teachers report that they are talking to each other about teaching more than in the past. They have occasion to do this because they are in organizational arrangements that foster this conversation -- student teaching seminars, team planning and mentor meetings, for example. Teachers are informing college faculty about teacher education, about the knowledge, skills and dispositions that would be helpful for novices to develop. Colleges report that they are listening more closely to what classroom teachers are telling them and report that it is useful....Student teachers and interns work more closely with veteran teachers and see a broader range of teaching roles than in the past. They see teachers work as classroom teachers, curriculum developers, teacher educators, and researchers. And, they see teachers working together, sharing materials and ideas. They see roles and structures that counter the traditional view of the isolated teacher. (Neufeld and Haavind, 1988, pp. 48-49)

In our initial look at PDS collaborations, we were interested in the kinds of effort and knowledge participants needed to begin their development. Now we are interested in their maintenance, form, content, and growth. Where have programs put their time and energy? What keeps teachers and faculty working together? How do they manage the complexity of the efforts? Why are programs seeking collaboration with new districts and colleges? What issues associated with collaboration between schools and colleges have arisen over time? What impact do the collaborations have on children's school experience? What are prospective teachers learning?

To find answers to these questions, we revisited two of the first six programs, East Longmeadow High School and the Academic Disciplines Teacher Education Program of the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, and The

Learning/Teaching Collaborative which began as the collaboration between the Devotion School (Grades K-8) in Brookline and Wheelock College. We also included a program newer to the PDS enterprise, the collaboration between the Coolidge Elementary School in Shrewsbury and Anna Maria College. We selected these three programs because, with very little external support, each has grown in size and expertise over the past few years; each has forged new relationships among teachers and teacher educators and among the institutions in which they work. All three are continuously reconsidering, intellectually and through practice, the form and content of teacher education on the campus and in the schools. Although other PDS programs could be studied, these three are further along now than most others. They also were willing to expose themselves to our scrutiny in order to help others who are embarking on similar enterprises.

We write this report to bring the three programs' accumulated wisdom and our analysis of it to others interested in developing school/teacher education collaborations. To this end, we a) provide an update on their PDS experience by describing the programs and their development over time; and, b) consider the organizational, contextual and pedagogical issues salient to their operation as they continue to forge ahead into school restructuring and teacher education reform.

Participating teachers and college faculty remain enthusiastic about their participation in these collaborations. They are eloquent about what they gain from their experiences. Their descriptions echo those reported two years ago. Nonetheless, the collaborations are not without complications. They continue to demand a great deal of time from all participants, to rely heavily on key individuals, to depend on continual infusions of external funding, and to create complicated intra- and inter-organizational relations. They are too new yet to have demonstrated that they lead to better teaching and, therefore, to enhanced learning for children. Data suggest that most college faculty are not enamored of the opportunity to work more intensively with schools. At each college, only one or two faculty members are closely involved with the PDS site, and, their colleagues are not clamoring for the opportunity to participate. Administrative support at the colleges is minimal.

Within the PDS schools sites, extant organization makes it difficult for classroom teachers to take on some of the roles theoretically available through the PDS. As a result, specialists and administrators, whose time is somewhat flexible to begin with, have more opportunities to try out the new roles. There is, in spite of these complications, a potential in each program for teacher education to become more reflective, for prospective and experienced teachers to learn to approach teaching as intellectual work, and for them to learn to be responsive to the range of teaching and learning strategies available to them as they consider the diversity of students in their classes. Programs are on their way to realizing that potential.[1]

## Organization of the Report

We present next descriptions of three unique variants of Professional Development Schools. Following these descriptions, we turn to issues associated with a) developing and implementing the teacher education content of the PDS programs, b) expanding the number of participating schools and individuals, and, c) developing the organizational and management capacities necessary to sustain the programs. We conclude with a review of the findings and some implications for other schools and colleges that wish to embark on this approach to reform.

---

[1] The data from which we derived our conclusions consist of a) prior knowledge of the sites from earlier studies, b) interviews with 29 teachers, interns/student teachers, administrators and college faculty from the three programs conducted between December 1989 and May 1990, c) document review, and d) a small number of observations of program components. We are grateful for participants' enthusiastic support in offering us their insights.

## THE PROGRAMS

### The Calvin Coolidge School/Anna Maria College Professional Development School

Responding to a perceived need for staff revitalization and enhancement of the student teaching experience, the principal of the Calvin Coolidge Elementary School (grades 1-4) invited Education faculty from Anna Maria College to join a planning team of teachers and administrators to conceptualize a collaborative model that would support the growth of pre-service and in-service teachers. During the 1987-1988 academic year, the planning team met to articulate core values and to carve out a working model built upon shared assumptions. These shared assumptions included the importance of reflective practice and collaborative professional development. The result was a model in which both teacher education students and experienced practitioners had scheduled opportunities to think about their work, and in which there was time for discourse among college faculty, Coolidge staff, and student teachers.

The model itself is loosely fashioned after that used to train medical interns and, as such, includes some key features and language of medical training. For example, not only are the student teachers referred to as "interns," but their group observations in other teachers' classes are called "doing the rounds." Typically, the rounds occur on the one-day-a-week that is specifically set aside for professional development. During that day, student teachers and the planning team make prearranged visits to classrooms in order to observe a specific topic or technique. Some topics taught to student interns in this way have been Integrated Language Arts, Learning Centers, Instructional Games, and Process Writing. Generally, the topic or technique is decided upon by the planning team, which also takes responsibility for asking teachers to allow the observation. The Collaborative teams conduct their visits after a "Pre-Round Orientation" and conclude with a reflective "Post Round Conference." Usually class coverage will be arranged through substitutes or the two Mentors in order for the Contributing Teacher to participate in the post-round conference in which his or her lesson is debriefed.

Other activities can occur on the professional development day, either in addition to or instead of "doing the rounds"; and, like the medical model, all of the professional development day activities occur at the clinical site. For example, there can be Special Topics Seminars in which a series of seminars are planned that focus upon a particular topic. Other development options include peer coaching, videotaping, discussion panels, and whole day intensive workshops. In this past academic year, some areas covered in the workshops were Critical Thinking Skills, Behavior Management, Special Education, Whole Language Strategies, and Cooperative Learning. The planning team, first-year Coolidge teachers, and the student interns from Anna Maria College all attend these whole day workshops. The last portion of the workshops is devoted to planning how the teachers and interns would implement the new technique or apply their new knowledge in the classroom the very next day.

At the heart of the model is a core planning team comprised of the school principal, two Mentor teachers who do not have regular classrooms, and a college faculty member. Their role is to plan, coordinate, and oversee the features of the model. One goal of the principal is to have all 25 staff members participate in the professional development program. Consequently, the model includes a variety of options for participation. For example, teachers can work as Cooperating Practitioners by directly supervising student teachers in their classrooms. They can be Contributing Teachers who invite student teachers and the planning team to observe their teaching, and who may present special workshops, lectures, panels, or demonstrations to the students. Finally, teachers who have participated as Cooperating Practitioners or Contributing Teachers can be invited by the planning team to become Guest Mentors. In this capacity, teachers are released from their teaching duties for a day in order to observe and discuss other teachers' classes alongside the planning team and the student interns.

During each semester since its implementation in the Fall of 1988, there have been one or two Collaborative Teams at the PDS. These teams consist of 3-4 student interns, 1 Mentor teacher and 1 clinical professor. Student interns apply to the college for placement in the PDS and the clinical faculty member associated with the PDS makes all selections. Each of the teams is enhanced by the work of the school administration, the planning team, the Cooperating Teachers, the Contributing Teachers, and the Guest Mentors.

For Additional Information Contact:

Arthur Bergeron, Principal, The Calvin Coolidge School
Tom Del Prete, Anna Maria College

### East Longmeadow High School and the Academic Disciplines Teacher Education Program of the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst

This secondary school, post-baccalaureate teacher education collaboration began in 1985 when the principal of East Longmeadow High School (now Associate Superintendent), asked the University of Massachusetts at Amherst to place a cohort of student teachers in his school. He had three purposes in mind when he made this request. First, he wanted an opportunity to "look over" a new group of prospective teachers because he knew that he would be in a position to hire some in the near future. Second, he wanted to excite his veteran faculty by offering them an opportunity to share their expertise with future teachers. His assumption was that by working with student teachers, veterans would regain some lost enthusiasm for their own teaching. And, third, he felt an obligation to work on reforming the profession.

The principal's focus was primarily on future hiring and his own faculty's professional needs. Faculty at the college had no difficulty with that focus, but they wanted to develop a clinical training site in which the school as well as individual cooperating teachers were supportive of prospective teachers' learning, a site in which there was close collaboration between university and school, that would help bridge the gap between theory and practice. Out of this set of goals, the East Longmeadow/University of Massachusetts at Amherst Collaboration was born.

The program that developed (and continues to evolve) now involves approximately 35 high school teachers who make a substantial commitment to work with student teachers and with the University. In any given semester, some will mentor, some will teach seminars, some will be University supervisors of student teachers, and some will teach or co-teach an education course at the University. The first time they work with student teachers, participating teachers complete University coursework in supervision and mentoring through participation in a seminar held at the high school and with tuition paid for by East Longmeadow. Coursework provides them with access to University faculty in a broad array of departments. In fact, this association has encouraged several teachers to pursue graduate study in degree programs at the University.

The PDS program begins with a serious recruitment and selection process. As part of their introductory education course, prospective student teachers spend a school day at East Longmeadow hosted by interested high school faculty. Prospective student teachers observe two or three classes, talk with teachers who have volunteered to spend time with them, and are, in effect, treated as "members of the faculty" for the day. This experience helps them understand more about high schools in general and specifically helps them decide whether they would like to student teach at East Longmeadow. If students wish to student teach at the high school, they must participate in an application and selection process that closely resembles the normal hiring procedure faced by first-year teachers. Teachers and administrators are involved in selection decisions. (At the end of their student teaching semester, each student has the opportunity to simulate more formally a job interview with the Associate Superintendent.)

When student teachers are in the high school, cooperating teachers along with the student teachers participate in an on-going, jointly planned seminar offered at the high school. Cooperating teachers who do not have a student teacher that term also participate, thus broadening the range of school faculty involved in teacher education. Seminar presenters address a variety of issues that concern prospective teachers. For example, one teacher presented a session on planning, sharing her course syllabi so students could understand both long and short-term planning. Another presented a session on dyslexia. As an outgrowth to these presentations, the collaboration hopes to develop teams of teachers who can serve as resources to student teachers on particular issues.

The seminar gives the entire cohort of student and cooperating teachers an opportunity to work together. It reinforces the "cohort" nature of the experience and, because students have input into the seminar program, it provides them with the opportunity to reflect on their own professional development needs and to decide what they would like to learn. This collegiality is a central feature of the professional development model. In addition to their own mentor and all of the cooperating teachers, students have available to them a clinical supervisor from the University who is on-site at East Longmeadow two days each week.

Finally, University faculty are engaged in an in-depth study of the development, implementation and impact of the development of the clinical training site. They intend to use their research both to improve the program and to inform the development of other clinical training sites. They have already applied what they have learned about schools, school personnel, and collaboration to the development of clinical sites in Greenfield and Holyoke.

For Additional Information Contact:

Peter Cannone, East Longmeadow Public Schools
Helen Schneider, University of MA, Amherst
Earl Seidman, University of MA, Amherst

## The Learning/Teaching Collaborative: Boston and Brookline Public Schools, Wheelock and Simmons Colleges

The Learning/Teaching Collaborative began in 1987 as the Devotion School, Brookline/Wheelock College collaboration, when two Devotion School teachers took action on their longstanding desire 1) to broaden teaching so that it no longer remained a "one-step career," 2) to involve teachers in schoolwide decision making, and 3) to lessen the isolation of teaching. The Devotion/Wheelock project developed out of their primary concern for restructuring teachers' roles. Involvement with pre-service teacher education was one component of the restructuring plan. The collaboration, from the perspective of the college, was a better way to bring together theory and practice for prospective teachers and help them explore new versions and dimensions of the teaching role. The program's design includes four components which, taken together, address the various goals: 1) Second Adult in the Classroom, 2) Professional Development, 3) In-Class Remediation, and 4) Team Teaching.

1. **Second Adult in the Classroom.** In this collaboration, a graduate, teacher education student serves a one-year, full-time internship with a participating Brookline teacher. The advantages of this component center on increased attention to children as a result of the additional adult, "coverage" so that the regular classroom teacher can leave the classroom to pursue professional development options, and a full-year, closely supervised teaching experience for the student teacher.

2. **Professional Development.** The professional development component is called Alternative Professional Teacher time (APT time). It provides teachers with the opportunity to spend up to one third of their time in exploring new roles that do not involve direct teaching. Teachers have used this time, for example, to pursue curriculum development, research how children learn to write fiction, to work as a college supervisor of student teachers, and to co-teach an education seminar at the college.

3. **In-House Targeted Programs.** This component of the program began as "in-house remediation" in which the special education teacher came into the classroom to provide services. With the expansion of the program, it now includes efforts to integrate bilingual students into the regular program. Speaking broadly, the component is designed to bring into the classroom services that would have been provided on a pull-out basis to children needing additional support services.

4. **Team Teaching.** In part, as an effort to reduce the isolation of teaching, classroom teachers in this collaboration

have chosen to do some team teaching. The extent and kind of team teaching varies; the original team is most heavily involved in this program component. For example, that team has planned jointly for teaching science units, and for discussing reading groups, record keeping and student progress. Most recently, they decided to restructure the school day in order to have large blocks of time devoted to specific subjects over a period of weeks. Built into the original team concept were three thirty-minute team meetings each week and a monthly half-day Saturday session. Expansion of the program has led to some variation on this meeting time.

By the 1989-1990 academic year, the program had grown to include interns from Simmons college, several schools within Brookline and two schools in Boston. With its expansion, the collaboration created a Steering Committee to provide direction and administrative support, a Management Team, and a coordinator position. The Steering Committee meets for two hours once a month and includes both the Dean and the Academic Dean, the Director of Student Teaching Placements and one faculty member from Wheelock, the Dean and the Director of Student Teaching Placements from Simmons, one principal, the Associate Superintendent of Schools and the Coordinator from Brookline, a principal and Zone Superintendent from Boston, one intern, and the teachers who also serve on the Management Team. The Steering Committee manages the on-going work of the collaborative and develops policy. The Management Team also meets for two hours, once a month, and consists of one member from each of the teaching teams involved in the collaboration. Its effort is to have on-going communication among the teams in Brookline and Boston. The coordinator, one of the founding classroom teachers, visits the teams, trouble shoots, identifies issues that should go to the Steering Committee and advocates for the teaching teams with administrators and/or the colleges. The selection of interns for this collaboration involves an intricate set of interviews with members of both the Steering and Management Teams. Following selection, interns are assigned to teachers on the basis of the certification they are seeking and through a lottery procedure.

For Additional Information Contact:
Vivian Troen or Kitty Boles, Devotion School, Brookline
Karen Worth, Wheelock College, Boston

## Considerations Across the Programs

Before analyzing the issues that arise from the programs' experiences, we want to set the context by highlighting several of the collaborations' significant accomplishments. First, the three programs have weathered well the difficult financial and educational seasons of the past few years. They have done more than sustain themselves; to varying extents, they have expanded within their schools, districts and regions. Second, virtually all of the individuals who were enthusiastic three years ago remain committed to the PDS collaborations, and additional teachers, administrators and, to a lesser extent college faculty, have become seriously involved with them. Third, in each of the PDS collaborations, teachers are talking to each other and to college faculty about improving teaching, learning and teacher education. They are inventing ways to improve their work with each other, with prospective teachers, and with students. And fourth, participating teachers' work is more varied; they often describe themselves as re-energized as a result of the PDS. In addition to their classroom responsibilities, teachers are working as seminar instructors, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, mentors, curriculum developers and researchers.

Our data also reveal that despite the commitment of many individuals, none of the collaborations is assured of continuing institutional support within its district regardless of its judged level of success. Financial resources are scarce and shrinking and the PDS is not usually a district priority. Moreover, none of the colleges is committed to maintaining or financially supporting these efforts. The PDS remains an attractive "add-on" or alternative which will survive to the extent that it does not require money from the core budgets of participating institutions. Programs continue to be funded by grants, creative budget maneuvering and donated over-time. The teachers, faculty members and administrators who work in these collaboratives worry every day about the future. Still, they operate in the present with great energy, resourcefulness and commitment.

These overall conclusions and the more elaborated discussion that follows derive largely from the experiences of the three sites described above. However, we do not speak about the collaboratives by name in this analysis. What they have done and learned is impressive. It has informed their thinking and ours.

Nonetheless, it would be a mistake to assume that the analysis we present and the issues that we identify reflect precisely the sites' experiences. Sometimes we do report directly. We also have a) generalized from the data; b) attempted to anticipate future events based on conversations with individuals in the collaborations; and c) considered the composite experience of the three sites.

Because the programs are distinct in form and content, because two are in elementary schools and one is in a high school, and because one more than the others relies on team teaching, there are aspects of our comments that may seem to apply to or come from one PDS site more than from another. Again, even if that is the case, we urge readers to use the ideas we present as food for thought, not as indicators of the success or shortcomings of individual PDS programs. [2]

We turn now to a discussion of three areas that have been a central focus of PDS work during the last two years -- the content of the PDS-based teacher education program, expansion of the opportunities for teachers, schools and colleges to participate in the PDS, and program organization and management.

---

[2]. The PDS collaboratives use a variety of terms to refer to people with different responsibilities in their programs. The individuals who work in classrooms with student teachers might be called mentors or cooperating teachers, for example. Student teachers might be called interns. For simplicity in reporting, and to conform with our effort to avoid reference to specific sites in the narrative, we use the following terms: Cooperating Teacher - the classroom teacher with primary responsibility for a student teacher; Student teacher - an individual completing a practicum as part of a formal teacher education program.

## THE PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION COMPONENT: DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING PROGRAM CONTENT

One key to the success of the first phases of PDS collaborations was agreement about the content of teacher education and the parameters of the student teaching experience. Teachers and college faculty joined together either because they already shared a common vision of the enterprise, or because, as a result of sitting together and working out their areas of agreement and disagreement, they came to a set of mutual understandings. As they implement their programs and learn from their experiences, PDS collaborations continue to consider what to include in the experience of student teachers and how to organize that learning. In addition, they deliberate about what experienced teachers and college faculty need to know and learn in order to help student teachers.

### Influences on Program Content

The discussion of program content in the PDS collaborations does not begin as if there were no agreement about what student teachers ought to learn by working in classrooms with experienced teachers. Teachers and college faculty working in PDS collaborations still want prospective teachers to master the rudiments of classroom management, to develop individual and unit lesson plans, to become familiar with the content taught at various grades and levels within subject areas, to learn how to deal with student diversity, and to create and implement appropriate student evaluation strategies, for example. The PDS's are focusing on **what** is important in each of those areas, **how** the student teaching experience ought to be organized to better accomplish those learning goals, and, **what else** ought to be included. Attention to content in the PDS is distinguished by its attention to the process component of learning to teach.

What are some of the content issues with which programs have dealt? All three programs, regardless of the differences among them, place primary emphasis on **the centrality of experience in learning to teach**. They want prospective teachers to "try out," to "get a feel for," and to "rehearse," the range of situations they will encounter when they are teaching on their own. Each collaboration's participants believe that the PDS should provide prospective teachers with a broader array of experiences than those available in traditional placements. The goal is not only to increase their competence, but to reduce some of the uncertainty that will accompany the first year on the job.

> I think good training is [getting] as much involvement and as much exposure to what the real life of a teacher is....They have to learn how to deal with students effectively....how to plan their lessons, discipline a class. There are so many different facets, so many variables that go into making a good teacher. (Teacher)

For student teachers involved in year-long placements, the depth as well as the breadth of the experiences is stressed.

> I think they learn the same things, but I think that the intern experiences them in much more depth and, therefore, learns them in a different and much more complete way than the student teacher does. The student teacher, at best, suddenly recognizes what it feels like to manage an entire classroom of children, plan curriculum, deal with crises, talk with parents, plan ahead and get enough sleep....The intern gets to move into

> that more slowly and so as they move in they get to explore certain aspects of it more in depth. (Teacher)

> I think that ...seeing either a child or a group or a piece of curriculum move from incoming day in September to June is something that is irreplaceable. You cannot see that in fifteen weeks of student teaching. (College Faculty)

Teacher education programs have always wanted student teachers to participate in a range of experiences. However, often there was no structure to guide implementation of such participation. Student teachers, left on their own, felt it was inappropriate, perhaps disloyal, to seek assistance from other than their cooperating teacher, or to attend a wide range of school activities without invitation. The PDS collaborations work to spell out clearly the range of experiences and individuals from whom student teachers can learn, and attempt to build structures through which they can accomplish the learning goals.

"Teaching rounds," for example, are a structure through which student teachers and other interested teachers listen to experienced teachers talk about what they are teaching, why they are teaching it and what they hope to accomplish. Then, after observing the teaching, the experienced and student teachers reflect together about the lesson. In the team teaching situation, teachers must plan jointly in structured team meetings. Pre-service teachers have the opportunity through participating in those meetings to hear the thinking that goes into curriculum development -- the emphasis on content, goals, child development and pedagogy -- as teachers work out their plans. In the series of workshops and seminars intrinsic to another PDS, student teachers also have a structure in which to learn from a range of teachers and hear them reflect on what they do and why they do it. Finally, in addition to the increased opportunities to learn to teach and to learn about the changing roles of teachers, two of the professional development schools have taken it upon themselves to include opportunities for student teachers to practice job interviews. These structured experiences are significant departures from those available in more traditional student teaching placements.

The PDS experience is distinguished not only by the range and structure of the experience, but by the **emphasis on collegial support and the reduction of isolation** for novices as they make the transition from student to teacher. Teachers and faculty associated with all three programs want prospective teachers to have the experience of turning to other teachers for assistance during student teaching so that they will turn to colleagues in future years when they have their own classrooms. There is an effort, in this aspect of program content, to end the prevailing custom in which teachers learn to rely on themselves and become isolated from what could be a community of professional colleagues who share professional expertise.

> What we want the student teachers to experience is communication with other student teachers, the support of other student teachers, being able to share and communicate similar experiences....It's important for them to...have a cooperating teacher and lots of other teachers in the building they can trust and confide in. It's not the old way with one student and one cooperating teacher. (Teacher)

Programs also desire to have prospective teachers see experienced teachers model professional, collegial relations. Some want student teachers to work in team-taught settings that involve joint curriculum planning, team teaching, and, for example, reflection about the impact of instruction on individual children and the group. The program that offers alternative professional roles for teachers shows prospective teachers the multiplicity of activities that can be attached to the title, teacher.

When the PDS collaborations began, participants in the two elementary programs dealt broadly with issues of **teaching quality**, with the question, "what is good teaching?" (The secondary school program, our data reveal, left such issues to the classroom teacher.) A college faculty member associated with an elementary PDS recalled injecting

> ...into the conversation questions like what good teaching is. What do we think learning is? How can we combine efforts to promote that? When we started to orient our discussions to these kinds of basic questions, it really forced us to confront our own assumptions...and to come up with something that we could all agree with. (Faculty)

Teachers and faculty in another elementary PDS agreed at the outset that they shared a common view of the kind of teaching they wanted to promote:

> [The PDS] specifically says that team teaching and cooperative goals are extremely important. Let's say an activity based room is extremely important and some of the teachers have a specific philosophy -- "whole-language." (Teacher)

Some participants struggled with the tension that arose when they realized that their views of good teaching might not prepare students for working in schools:

> My specific feeling on [whole language] is that these interns may have to go into a school system where basal reader is taught or whole language, so I try to give them a little of everything. I am not doctrinaire, although I like kids to be able to write by the time they leave my room. (Teacher)

From time to time, program expansion led to the inclusion of teachers and faculty who did not fully share the original program's conception of good teaching and teacher education supervision. This led to some misunderstandings and the creation of opportunities for teachers and college faculty to revisit issues of teaching quality. (We discuss this issue more fully in the section of the report that focuses on program expansion.)

Issues of philosophy entered discussions of **learning to teach** as well as of teaching. In making choices about what to include in the teacher education program and how to teach it, teachers and teacher educators operated from a set of assumptions about **how** one learns to teach from the available experiences. One may learn by **adopting** the skills and strategies of the cooperating teacher, or by **adapting** them, for example. Individuals and programs have not articulated or codified their thoughts on this issue, and their programs reflect a diversity of opinion. Some teachers in the professional development schools we have studied believe that learning to teach, in part, involves being exposed to an array of practices in order to choose those that fit best with one's own personality. As a teacher at one PDS said, "The student teachers get to see a variety of ways to do one particular thing and then they can pick and choose the one that best fits their own teaching personality."

In contrast to ideas of exposure and picking and choosing, there are a few teachers who applaud the collaboration and collegiality and new roles, but who fundamentally think of teacher preparation not as a matter of finding a personal style, but rather one of **copying the expert**. One such teacher reports that he is even more convinced now than when he began working in the PDS that student teaching time should be spent learning the style that the classroom teacher feels is most effective even if the student teacher rejects it the following year. Although individual teachers might hold this view, none of the three PDS collaborations as **programs** envision student teaching as a time for copying the cooperating teacher. Instead, they consider careful analysis of practice, often called "reflection," critical to learning to teach and to teaching. The large majority of cooperating teachers want novices to constructively critique what they have seen and done in order to evaluate and improve current and future practice. For example,

> The student teachers have a time in their schedules for what we call reflection [when] they think about the kinds of things that they saw during the day, and discuss them. They go off by themselves and they're very free to question a particular technique or comment on it or think about how they might put it into their classroom. (Teacher)

Programs vary in the extent to which they identify the criteria student teachers should apply when reflecting. We have little data to suggest that student teachers are asked to reflect on the interconnection of teaching strategy, specific content, and student diversity within a given class, for example. In all of the PDS collaborations, regardless of how student teachers are asked to consider what they are learning, their comfort with a particular approach seems to be the most widely adopted criteria influencing the choice of teaching strategies they wish to continue.

Finally, PDS faculty and teachers have different views on **the process by which student teachers should begin teaching.** Some believe that students should begin gradually, observing first, then working with individual students, and finally working with groups and the entire class. Others believe that student teachers should begin by teaching on the first day. These orientations or philosophies influence the content of the program, especially at the beginning of the student teaching experience. They have become important as new faculty and teachers join the collaborations.

For example, teachers and faculty who began the collaboration might agree that student teachers should arrive at the practicum knowing a great deal about curriculum materials related to language arts and that they should be reasonably able to turn a topic into a series of lesson plans. Such knowledge, the PDS participants might argue, can be learned on campus and enables the student teacher to begin working with children on the first day of school. A faculty member new to the project, **even if from the same college**, might disagree that this is the appropriate set of beginning knowledge and skills. She might want student teachers to be knowledgeable about child development and the appropriateness of certain kinds of learning activities for certain levels of development. She might want the student teacher to begin by observing students rather than teaching them. She might want the cooperating teacher to instruct the student in the creation of lesson plans in the context of specific curriculum and children.

As collaboratives have continued and expanded, they have found that such differences can interfere with the cohesion of the program. They have had to grapple with defining their own orientation to learning to teach and teaching in order to decide whether specific individuals are compatible with the PDS or whether and how the PDS could accommodate different views. These are not necessarily troublesome issues; they are issues which much be resolved if the PDS wishes to maintain a reasonably coherent orientation to learning to teach.

Attention to program content has led PDS collaborations to consider **what experienced teachers need to know** in order to work as cooperating teachers. In the traditional approach, colleges selected teachers known to be effective in their classrooms and willing to work with student teachers. The college might have provided a set of guidelines for the cooperating teacher; but rarely was there formal preparation for the role. Cooperating teachers, like student teachers, were expected to learn through the experience of working with a student teacher.

The teachers, administrators and faculty developing the PDS's realized that if they wanted student teachers to have appropriate experiences, it would be advantageous to provide opportunities for cooperating teachers to brush up on some knowledge and skill.

> We've come to recognize over the last two years that our efforts to help the student teachers develop will only be fruitful to the extent that we can help the other teachers think and work and collaborate in the same kinds of ways. (Faculty)

Each PDS has taken a different approach to preparing teachers to work with student teachers. In one, teachers enroll in a formal seminar, which is taught at the school, either prior to or during the first term that they work with a student teacher. During the first year of the PDS, the seminar was taught by the college faculty member who spends two days a week in the school as part of her job. Now she co-teaches it with two teachers who have served as cooperating teachers. They contribute to the content of the course; they add legitimacy to the college faculty's perspective; they identify practical applications for the theoretical knowledge learned on campus; and, they demonstrate new roles for classroom teachers.

Teachers in this PDS designed a handbook for their colleagues that focused on a range of topics they found essential for working with student teachers. The process of collaboratively developing the handbook gave teachers opportunities to clarify their own ideas about roles and consider what they wanted their colleagues to know. This was something they had not done before. Cooperating teachers found the seminar so stimulating that several reported regretting that they could participate in it only before taking on their first student teacher.

At the start of the third year of operation, cooperating teachers in another PDS realized that they needed to know more about working in teams in order to implement their program. They attended workshops on teaming that dealt with the pedagogical, organizational and interpersonal aspects of such ventures. In the spring, they participated together with college supervisors in a series of seminars concerning the supervision of student teachers. The design and implementation of both of these staff development opportunities grew out of the experience of expanding the programs and discovering what participants needed to learn in order to work successfully in the complicated organization.

**The experienced teachers' staff development needs (and desires) unrelated to working with student teachers** also influenced program content. In one PDS, the principal wanted his faculty to learn, among other things, how to implement cooperative learning and increase children's use of higher order thinking skills. The PDS developed teaching examples and workshops for experienced and student teachers that provided opportunities to learn these skills. The college wanted its students to acquire these pedagogical techniques, but it was the staff development wishes of the principal that led to early attention to them. The experienced teachers' desire for more team teaching, and a structure that would permit them time during the school day for curriculum development and individual research, led to the design of another PDS. Program content and form, in other words, have been influenced by the educational needs of both pre-service and experienced teachers.

Program content is influenced by the PDS's **orientation to extant school organization.** Two of the PDS collaborations are interested in doing a better job of preparing teachers to teach in schools as they are currently organized. Teachers and faculty want students to understand how schools and classrooms work so that they can move into the roles as they exist and make sense of the situations they encounter. The PDS's go about achieving this goal in different ways. One sees experience as an inoculation; it prepares teachers for what is to come:

> Right now I am supervising a student teacher who...teaches mathematics at a very low level and to a very advanced class. And it's amazing to see the diversity in his teaching. [It's] almost as if he's bored with...the low-level kids, but yet very challenged by the advanced students. And it's good for him to be able to experience that. Because he probably will [experience it again] when he gets out there in the real field. (Teacher working as a college supervisor)

The support structure for such a student teacher is new. He has many colleagues to turn to for ideas about how to teach each of the classes, about how to "get through" the low-level class. The message, that it is understandable that teachers do not like teaching low-level students and that the problem with such classes is located in the student, however, does not suggest an improvement in the preparation of teachers. The increased experience and support provided by a PDS, the process side of the reform, can be connected to a wide range of content.

In contrast, another PDS collaboration that prepares teachers for today's schools developed the teacher education curriculum with the goal of helping prospective teachers examine not only their practice but the assumptions behind their practice. They considered ways to convey the idea that teaching is an interactive and reflective practice in which teachers need to respond to children's needs, interests, and experiences.

> In the course of the program [we] try to get them to articulate why they do things and what it is that is important to them. We do it through...a combination of collaborative coaching and reflective practice where we work all together to try to help each student teacher develop...good rationales for why we're going to [teach] what we're going to...and we come back and talk about it further [after the teaching]. (Faculty)

The PDS's stance vis a vis current school organization influences program content; it allows considerable latitude for variation.

**College supervisors may also influence program content.** They, like cooperating teachers and faculty, have views on what should be included in a student's experience and the ways in which they should be introduced to teaching. The orientation of faculty members, in particular college supervisors, to the PDS has proved to be important in developing and sustaining program content. Collaborations that have added college supervisors without explaining the unique features and requirements of the clinical site, for example, have found that faculty members feel left out and frustrated. One such faculty member commented, "I'm lacking a total picture. I only know about my interns, not how they are related into the broader picture." Part of the reason for this situation is the primary focus on increasing the role of cooperating teachers. Part of the reason can be attributed to program growth -- an increase in the number of student teachers in the PDS sites which necessitated a rapid increase in the number of supervisors. And another part of the explanation is lack of attention to the content of supervision from the college.

## Implementing the Program Content

The content of the PDS teacher education program occurs in the classroom, in special seminars and meetings that take place at the school and on-campus, and in the relationship between the college supervisor and the student teacher. One feature common to all of the collaborations is the elaboration of new opportunities and settings in which to learn to teach, and expanded roles for classroom teachers in preparing new teachers.

In one PDS, teachers present workshops for student teachers during the weekly professional development day. A Mentor teacher, compensated for spending part of her time working with the PDS, stays in the classroom to provide coverage for an experienced teacher who might like to attend. Workshop topics have included cooperative learning, behavior management, and reciprocal teaching, for example. One teacher enthusiastically described a workshop that she and a colleague presented:

> We showed them how to construct games that would use skills. We had math, we had whole language games that they were making, spelling game boards using stickers...it was like a make and take kind of thing. We brought in some supplies. We showed them a few of our games...They wrote down ideas, copied a lot of our games, they made one and took it....We explained that a lot of times if you're working with a group of children and others are finished, what are you going to say? "Here's a worksheet, go sit down and do it?" We're trying to get away from that kind of busy work kind of thing. You can tell them to pick up a game....And as they answer [the game questions], they're doing their skills, but they think they're having a

> great time....now [the student teachers] know how to make games, why you use them and when you use them. (Teacher)

Although these teachers had worked with student teachers before, they had never had the opportunity to share their knowledge with a group of student teachers and colleagues.

Teachers who had gone to a conference on cooperative learning spent time with the student teachers sharing what they had learned and some of the handouts. Student teachers then had an opportunity to observe and try lessons using cooperative learning. From such workshops, prospective teachers have access to content, and they see that regular classroom teachers have the expertise with which to teach them and other experienced teachers. The message about the expertise and competence of teachers outside of the classroom and the vision of multiple roles for teachers is also significant content in all of these endeavors. Teacher-led workshops occur in all three of the PDS collaborations.

**College supervisors also have a role in implementing program content**, yet there is often only a small amount of communication between the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher in traditional student teaching arrangements. Large teacher education programs frequently have difficulty recruiting for these positions and the turnover rate from semester to semester is very high. This means that supervisors are more likely to provide generic assistance to their student teachers than program specific assistance. Even small teacher education programs have difficulty with the role of college supervisor, given that faculty members are not rewarded within the college system for their work in the schools. Under the current certification requirements of Massachusetts, the college supervisor, cooperating teacher and student teacher must meet together three times to discuss the form and content of the practicum, participants' roles and the quality of the students' work. Despite the formal structure, however, supervision is often weak. PDS collaborations have sought ways to strengthen this component of teacher education.

Two of the PDS programs have found ways for teachers to work as college supervisors of student teachers. Although they are successful ventures, and no teachers are taking jobs from campus-based supervisors, they raise questions about qualifications and long-held beliefs about knowledge and skill. For some college faculty:

> ...there is lingering...that sense that the teacher isn't good enough to do it. Nobody says that. And nobody really believes it, but it's the myth....and it needs to be confronted. (Faculty)

Each of the PDS collaborations intends to have a much closer working relation between the cooperating teacher, student teacher, and college supervisor. The collaborations vary in the extent to which they are meeting their own objectives in this area. In one PDS, the supervisor role evolved as one use of the Alternative Professional Time component. In another PDS, the arrangement involved several teachers working as supervisors; it was as critical to maintaining the coherence of the PDS as it was for providing new roles for teachers. Traditional approaches to providing university supervision run counter to the philosophy of the collaborations:

> Last year we had...too many interns and the University couldn't provide us with enough [supervisors]. They filled in with graduate students as they normally do. That doesn't work in a clinical site as far as I'm concerned. What makes a clinical site work is getting to know who the University people are and developing a rapport with them....[so that] when they come in, it's like they're part of the faculty and they can sit down and talk and feel comfortable with each other. When you get a one semester graduate student who's assigned two student teachers, that doesn't [happen]. (School Administrator)

There are structural constraints resulting from different academic year calendars at the colleges and schools that create supervision difficulties. For example, in one of the collaboratives, the student teachers begin their work in schools prior to the start of the college year. The supervisor does not begin the fall semester until the student teacher has been at the site for three to four weeks. This means that student teachers in the PDS do not have any formal orientation as a group from the college; they do not have the seminar, another formal, college-based support system in place at the start of their practicum; and they do not have an on-site visit from their supervisor until three to four weeks of the term have elapsed. The supervisor can be made somewhat marginal as a result of being a late addition to the already working team of the student teacher and cooperating teacher.

This kind of calendar related issue can be resolved, but it requires accommodations on the part of the college, in this case. The public schools cannot start later in September to accommodate the colleges; the student teachers have no reason to wait until the end of September to begin their work in classrooms.

For participants to realize the potential of college supervision, cooperating teachers, faculty and college supervisors need to work out their individual and joint roles. In the early years of the collaborations, participants did this. It took time, but was relatively uncomplicated due to the a) small numbers of individuals initially involved at each site, and b) the fact that they had come together, for the most part, because they shared common views of the new relationships. As programs expand, they need to pay attention again to developing formal relationships between a larger set of supervisors and cooperating teachers. They need to pay attention to at least the following set of questions: How often should the supervisor be on-site if the supervisor is a) another classroom teacher, or b) an on-campus faculty member? Should the supervisor and cooperating teacher work on the same kinds of learnings with the student teacher? Might the supervisor, for example, stress broad connections between theory and practice and between one particular classroom and the broader array of classrooms, while the cooperating teacher emphasizes the specifics of her classroom? What is the authority relation between the supervisor and cooperating teacher? If the supervisor is another classroom teacher in the school, how will that individual be able to intervene if the cooperating teacher is not doing an adequate job of working with the student teacher?

## Impact on Teacher Education

College faculty in all three programs agree that student teachers participating in PDS collaboratives have a wider range of experience during student teaching than do their peers who fulfill traditional student teaching placements. They are exposed to more teaching strategies, to a greater range of classroom settings through opportunities to observe, to a wider array of school activities in which they must participate, and to a broader view of the role of classroom teachers and the opportunities for collegial interaction and collaboration. In the year-long experience, they have the opportunity to experience the cycle of the school year and see the fruits of their work with students and their own growth. Depending on the setting, some student teachers learn to work on collaborative teams and to observe teachers taking on curriculum development, research and teacher education roles.

Yet, at the same time, participating teachers and faculty are not quite in agreement about the impact of the experience. Most teachers are quite sure that the experience is far superior to what it used to be; a few are more uncertain. College faculty support the programs, but are tentative in their assessment of its impact. They comment on the benefits of the traditional approach as well as the PDS. More of the faculty who are newly involved as a result of program expansion, wonder whether there is much substantial difference in what graduates know and are able to do as a result of their PDS experience when that experience is compared to their working with a fine cooperating teacher in a traditional arrangement. After all, as some faculty indicate, with the exception of the field experience and the associated seminar, the teacher preparation program remains the same for those who do and do not participate in the PDS.

> ...they still do everything else essentially the same as the rest of the students. There are no differences in course requirements. There are no differences in advisement; very little difference in advisement....all of our supervisors supervise some of the [students in the PDS site and some in traditional placements]....essentially, it is the same program. The courses have not changed at all. It's the placement that really makes the [program] difference for them. (Faculty)

There may be good reason for faculty to question the PDS impact. After all, traditional teacher education programs continue to predominate at the colleges. Many faculty teach in both programs; some supervise students in both traditional and PDS sites. These faculty have confidence in the efficacy of the traditional program, a confidence that grows out of experience with its capacity to prepare teachers who are successfully employed. The question of what is learned from the traditional and PDS student teaching experiences and whether and in what ways those differences manifest themselves when the student teachers begin their teaching careers, remains to be answered. From the faculty members' perspective, the PDS may add important components to student teaching, without fundamentally changing what prospective teachers learn.

From the teachers' perspective, on the other hand, the world of difference in the experience must lead to improvements in learning. They work in that component of the teacher education program that is most changed by the PDS. They see that they have considerably more influence in the new arrangement than they did in the past. Their roles are more varied; their expertise is called upon more often and in multiple ways. Many teachers, too, continue to work as traditional cooperating teachers. When they consider the differences in what they do and what they are able to contribute to student teachers, it is no wonder that they see large differences in their roles and in the learning opportunities for student teachers.

It is difficult to tell whether the teacher education in place now is significantly different in terms of content and outcomes than it was in the past. Without doubt, the PDS sites provide closer collaboration and coordination between the college and the school than in the past: participants from both institutions have sat down together and considered the form and content of the pre-pre-service experience. Seminars for teachers and student teachers are held at the school. Teachers and college faculty participate together in the planning and implementation of the seminars. Student teachers have a cohort experience that encourages the kind of professional collaboration that each of the programs stresses. Many teachers and college faculty spoke about the closer collaboration and coherence of the programs:

> What I am saying is that people that are assigned by the University to supervise understand the seriousness of purpose that we have with [the PDS] and therefore they are actively involved. They don't just make a token appearance and disappear. They are in frequent contact with the mentors....I think we've broken down the sense of isolation...that often exists between a school of education and a school system where

> practice teachers are placed. There is a genuine sense of cooperation. (Teacher)

They believe that this translates into a more positive learning experience for student teachers:

> We're [now] better equipped to help [student teachers] learn the mechanics of teaching....we take people who have ability and desire to teach and the personality that goes with that and provide them with very specific skill developments that make them effective. I guess if I were to give you a bottom line....if you asked the people that leave here if they feel they've been well-trained after they've been on their own in another school system for a year or so, they would say, for the most part, yes, they were well-trained. They felt equipped to deal with teaching in their first job. (Teacher)

A key indicator of program success is the students' ability to "deal with teaching in their first job," and to know better what features of a school environment are important to them. PDS administrators and teachers noted that student teachers were able to ask better questions of prospective employers as a result of their novel experiences.

For another PDS, impact is seen in teachers' ability to work in ways that are not found in most schools and to teach in ways that they may not be able to use right away given the traditional approaches present in most schools. The impact is seen in creating teachers for schools as they might be:

> I think it's terrific that they're learning to work in teams. I think that's one of the strong things....They go out with a very different perspective on what teaching can be, which I think is a wonderful thing. They're not necessarily able to do it where they go, but they're really seeking it out, searching for it... (Faculty)

It is, of course, a question as to how long a teacher will remember the teaming experience or the benefit of seeking advice from colleagues, if she does not have the opportunity to use that knowledge on the job.

The professional development schools are designed to benefit prospective teachers, current teachers, and, of course, students. We do not know yet whether they are having that desired impact, nor indeed, what standards we would use to judge them. But even without hard data, we can describe teachers', administrators' and college faculty's views on the impact of the PDS collaborations to date on various participants.

## Impact on Teachers

Experienced teachers are quite clear about the ways in which the programs benefit them. They explain that **they have increased their professional knowledge and skill** through the various arrangements. Teachers learn from their student teachers, from their work with each other, from observing each other and from their work with college faculty.

> I feel like I've grown a lot from this. I've been exposed to other teachers' lessons and the way they do things which I would probably not have seen...I was invited to go on the day of rounds...I got to observe how other teachers work, which was really good because we don't have that opportunity as teachers to go to other rooms...And then we talked about how we felt about it, what we would have changed in our classroom. (Teacher)

> It has definitely made me more aware of what's new in education and [kept me] on top of the very latest of strategies and trends;...[also] when I'm looking at magazines like The Reading Teacher or Language Arts or even the Kappan or something of that nature, I'm not only looking for information for myself, but I'm constantly looking for something that I might be copying to share with the students....It definitely keeps me on my toes. (Teacher)

> It's kind of ironic in a way. When I first was approached...I didn't want to have a [student teacher]. I felt that it was

> going to interfere with my teaching....And when I had that first intern, it took me a matter of days to realize, wow, I can do all these things now that I couldn't do before. And I got really excited about it. Plus, they have ideas that you don't have.... they have new and innovative ideas....When the end of the semester came, I said, "Geez, I don't really want to teach the [way I used to] now. If I go back to the old way, it's not going to be as good. (Teacher)

> I've had more contact with my colleagues in a serious professional dialogue than ever before....The contact has been interdisciplinary as well. (Teacher)

> As we studied to be (cooperating teachers), we learned so much more about what it is to be a teacher. It's helped me to be a better teacher....Basically, I have really learned...how important it is to have the learning in the classroom be active....I'm trying to get much more involved in cooperative education; to help my interns get more involved in this, in more group work. (Teacher)

> When those interns come into your classroom...you have to help them learn how to teach. You start analyzing your own [teaching]. You start looking; you think, "I'm telling them that this is the way I do things. Well, maybe I should be trying some different kinds of things...." When you see them, too, it's an interchange. They bring freshness, youth, vigor, energy....(Teacher)

Some of the college faculty have also commented on the benefits for experienced teachers:

> We went into this model thinking that it was a model for pre-service training. I am convinced now that it's the best approach to the in-service teacher. When you have experienced teachers processing and thinking about teaching and sharing those thoughts with new teachers, it takes things to a new level, a new consciousness about the work and feeling good about the work....Involved with that is creating a community of teachers who are involved in teacher education. You build a community among them, a sense of belonging to a school's effort, and give them the opportunity to share. I hear over and over again how they now talk to teachers for the first time in years and years. (Faculty)

According to faculty working in another PDS, as a result of closer consideration of their teaching, cooperating teachers demonstrate increased skill and confidence in working with student teachers:

> ...there is a small, modest, incremental change in their attitude. They're confident about bringing a new teacher into the field....[more thoughtful about] that whole issue of, "How do you work with a new teacher? What's the development? What's the role of criticism and judgment? How do you get them to be more reflective, to reconstruct their own experiences without you telling them what to think about?"...I feel better about the clinical sites. (Faculty)

**Classroom doors are open more often and wider** as a result of professional development school activities. The programs encourage teachers to observe each other and talk about their teaching. Keeping the doors open makes teachers more aware of what they are doing. One teacher talked about the effect of "rounds" on her teaching:

> When you know somebody is coming in and you want to really show the student teachers what you can do,...You don't have to follow along like with the teachers' manual....You can be thrown a curveball and make a really good lesson out of that and tie it in, integrate it with your other subjects....I like to be challenged, so this gave me the opportunity to come up with something. (Teacher)

Overall, teachers in these schools express excitement about their work with colleagues, with student teachers, and with their own students. **They feel better about themselves professionally and personally. They are no longer isolated from their colleagues, but part of a professional community.**

> I love this model. I'm sure there are others that are as effective, but I just love the fact that so many people touch the lives of the student teachers when they are in our building and that they can pick and choose what they like and leave the rest. (Teacher)

> I think it's made work more interesting....It's something else to think about and concentrate on. It's not the same thing day in, day out....It's very challenging here. And I think it's brought the staff together. It might not have happened otherwise because [with the PDS] we get the chance to spend

> some time together, talking professionally. But during that time of enjoying each other's company, [we are also] getting to know each other. (Teacher)
>
> I think it's really nice to have somebody to talk to....It may not seem to be that big of a deal, but teachers don't talk to adults all day. They talk to kids....I think it's really great to have an adult with you during the day to talk to....It seems real lonely now when I don't have one there, when they leave and I'm by myself. (Teacher)
>
> It makes you feel more important...I think it gives a lift to some people. I think being recognized for what you do is important. I think putting together a...handbook and having your name appear on the back of it, those are all important things that make teachers feel good about themselves....It's some work, but I think it also kind of revitalizes you. (Teacher)

Some teachers have been sparked to continue their own education, returning to school for additional courses or enrolling in degree programs.

One goal of the Professional Development School movement nationally is to broaden teachers' roles so that their job is not the same the day they retire as it was the day they began. It is an effort to preserve and transmit teachers' knowledge that develops over years of practice in the classrooms to new teachers and to college-based teacher educators. Each of the professional development schools has forged ways for teachers **to become involved in new roles** that work towards these ends.

Teachers in all three of the PDS's teach at the college. In one school, the teacher had this role as an additional job prior to the development of the PDS; in the other two, these opportunities accompanied the development of collaborative models. Teachers co-teach with faculty members and they teach alone. The impact can be profound:

> [this teacher] taught his own section this year and he said he had all this anxiety about college teaching. It's interesting, because he has no anxiety for high school teaching. He came to me in our last class last Thursday and said that the students had applauded him at the end of the class. Some people told him it was the best teaching they'd ever had at [the college]. He was overwhelmed. (Faculty)

The teacher himself commented:

> Like any new experience, I was very apprehensive about teaching college people. [It was] the credibility issue. I wasn't a professor. How would the students perceive me? Would they be angry that they did not have a professor teaching this course? I think that I've established my credibility. They are very fascinated with what I have to say about the profession because I'm a practitioner. (Teacher)

Teachers are also involved in developing criteria for selection of interns and in the interviewing and selection process. Teachers perceptions of the impact of the PDS collaborations on themselves can be summed up by the comment of one teacher who said, "We have started to move the professional development school beyond the student teachers. "

## Impact on College Faculty

The impact of the PDS collaborations has been significant for those faculty most intimately engaged in its design and implementation. There is no indication that the colleagues of participating faculty have become eager to join the collaborations or to revise their courses or supervision practices in light of PDS activities. At each college, the number of faculty who have been influenced by the PDS is small. We are not suggesting that the small number is insignificant; only that the collaborations so far have remained apart from mainstream teacher education on each of the campuses.

**For involved faculty members, however, participation has increased their appreciation for the role that teachers can play in improving the form and content of teacher education at the school and at the college.** This has been especially salient in areas of classroom practice. For example, one faculty member had never been sold on the advantages of team teaching for teachers or for students. Now that she has been involved with classroom teachers who team teach, she reports seeing its "virtues," and wanting her students to learn how to teach in teams. Participating in the PDS has increased her knowledge of the array of effective teaching strategies.

College faculty at all sites reported their **increased regard for the capacity of school people to "sell" the collaboration to other school districts.** The three PDS collaborations were interested in expanding to include other districts. Faculty found that it was the local teachers and administrators who had the knowledge, skill and credibility with which to approach their colleagues and explain the details, benefits and costs of collaboration.

And, finally, just as faculty came to more fully appreciate classroom teachers, **teachers came to regard faculty as professionals who had knowledge and skill that could benefit future teachers.** The close collaboration, according to faculty, led to mutual regard and appreciation for each other's role:

> I hated that I used to walk into schools and feel uncomfortable. I hated that there was always skepticism about

> you and you had to prove your credibility....You know...you get tired of that. It's really nice to go into a school and feel welcomed. I'm pretty sure I'm going to co-teach a course [at the high school] and that teacher will come up here and teach a course at the university. This is a different relationship. It's nice to walk into a school and not just hear about how "my teachers screwed up." (Faculty)

These changes would not have happened without mutual commitment to work together and join the various knowledge bases in a common purposes. Faculty members and teachers involved in these collaborations work hard to teach and learn from each other.

## Impact on Public School Students

There is no hard data indicating that the PDS collaborations have an impact, for better or for worse, on students. Yet teachers and some faculty believe that, for the most part, they are beneficial. They cite the following kinds of evidence. At both the elementary and secondary levels, **the PDS's provide students with exposure to and comfort with a greater number of adults.** Participants argue that this benefits students in numerous ways:

> They're not afraid to have a group of people walk into the room. They don't feel intimidated...They're also more willing to share what they're working [on]. They may work in a cooperative group setting and an adult will walk over and participate in it for a minute and question them on it and they're very willing to share,...to say, "Come on and try it with us." (Teacher)

> There's a lot more one-on-one teaching going on with every student in the building....They might have two adult members working with their group so there's a lot of support or clarification or whatever kind of thing needs to be done. (Teacher)

Students may also benefit because **the programs are drawing attention to and reinforcing the kinds of teaching that faculty believe will benefit children in the long run.** For example, in teaching expository writing, English teachers point out that having a student teacher increases the attention that each student can get during writing time.

> Now it's a lot easier because I have another person and we can get to everybody. It's provided a lot more alternatives... [now] one of us can be with the kids in the library; one of us can be in the room or in the writing center working with the computers. There's just so many other things that we can do.... (Teacher)

The same is true in virtually every discipline.

Having a student teacher makes the teacher's own work more visible. In several instances, **teachers commented that the presence of the intern led them to change their practices or to teach more creatively because someone other than the students was watching.**

> Frequently, I think it's a temptation for a teacher in high school to dismiss a student rather sarcastically. If you haven't gotten a response you want from the student, it's easy to pass by and say something to the effect that the student probably couldn't care less....And I don't think I'll ever do that again because I don't like to hear that echo of myself [reflected in the student teachers]. You see yourself reflected in the student teachers all the time....[Also] there were times when I [would say], "Alright, I'll teach Medea and I'll just teach it. I won't bother getting the film....I want to get through Medea and get onto something else." But the fact that there was a student teacher watching me made me far more aware of what I was doing....I wanted to be prepared....so that must be a benefit to the students. (Teacher)

On the whole, faculty and teachers feel that there are advantages for students as a result of their teachers' involvement in teacher education activities and as a result of having an additional adult in the classroom. Yet, a few individuals have concerns that arise because of the increased presence of student teachers. Some of these concerns were discussed at the beginning phases of the program; others are new.

First, **a few participants worry that student teachers may be taking on too much teaching too soon** (a problem that occurs in some traditional student teaching arrangements as well). The danger is that students will be taught by a student teacher who is not yet capable of teaching the subject or the particular students. Second, **they worry that if the student takes on too much teaching too soon, the supervisory demands will be beyond those that can be provided by the classroom teacher.** Third, they **are concerned, especially at the secondary school level, that students will have too many student teachers during a given school year or semester, resulting in a diminished quality of instruction.** As yet, there is no evidence that these situations have occurred. They are, however, areas to keep in mind as programs develop.

One factor that might lead to a student teacher taking on too much responsibility too soon is the structure of the program. If the experience is organized to include the student teacher as a full, albeit novice member of the team, teachers may be eager to have the student teacher fulfill that role from the outset. Programs will have to balance the need for full participation, with a timetable and support system that attend to the students' as well as the student teachers' educational needs. All of the PDS sites currently do attend to these issues.

## Summary

At this point, we are unable to draw conclusions about whether, in what ways in which and to what extent future teachers are better prepared in PDS sites. First, we did not collect the kind of data necessary to the task. And second, it is not yet clear what criteria to apply to these new ventures. The programs are developmental; they respond to a set of needs for experienced as well as prospective teachers; but none has articulated a clear set of outcomes by which to judge their success. Such outcomes should be delineated as the programs develop, but we suspect that they will be difficult to measure even in the long run. The impact of variation in teacher education programs on learning to teach appears not to be very large. So, on one level, these PDS collaborations are yet another variation, and we should not expect too much of an impact. On the other hand, they are taking teacher education in the direction recommended by the latest research and thinking on the subject. Prospective teachers are spending more time in programs that have made significant strides toward preparing them for their work with the students. Certainly, there is reason to think that the enterprise is more thoughtful and coherent than it has been in the past.

The proof of the impact, however, may not appear until several years down the road when these teachers have had experience in their own schools and classrooms. Do they incorporate recent research into their teaching? Are they able to collaborate with their peers to develop curriculum? engage in research? take on multiple teacher education roles for pre-service and in-service teachers? Do they consider themselves successful in their work with students? What is the impact for students of working with teachers who have been prepared in these PDS sites? We will need answers to these questions, but it will likely be a long time before we can obtain them.

## EXPANDING PARTICIPATION

Each collaboration began with one school, one college, and a few teachers, administrators and college faculty who viewed collaboration as the way to accomplish a set of educational objectives related to teaching and teacher education. The initial small scale meant that programs could manage with the human and financial resources available. And, they could try out ideas and make changes without disrupting the on-going operation of existing programs and practices. They could begin as pilot ventures within schools and colleges that might not be eager to make major organizational changes, but which would support alternative special programs or approaches.

From the outset, however, all of the collaborations intended to expand within their original site and to additional sites. None wanted to remain either a pilot or a special, isolated program within the school. A few college faculty wanted to see some changes in the college's campus-based program. Participants anticipated that when the original program was underway, they would have the time and resources essential for expansion. What they learned was that the opportunity to expand could come in the form of necessity, from financial and organizational pressures.

One source of pressure was the need for additional financial support. The opportunity to apply for grant money targeted to joint PDS ventures with urban school districts, for example, was a direct incentive for this set of collaborations to seek urban school partners. Second, discrepancies arose between the growing number of available and eager cooperating teachers and a scarce supply of student teachers. The scarcity led to pressure for associations with additional teacher education programs that had student teachers to place in the PDS. Third, some districts felt that they were treating teachers and schools in ways that were inequitable by not providing them with access to a) the various teacher education roles provided by the collaborations, and b) new teaching and curriculum ideas that might benefit students. The desire to reduce inequity led to pressure to increase the size of the PDS collaborations. Fourth, state policy initiatives such as changes in certification requirements encouraged broader participation. A few colleges sought to join existing PDS collaborations in order to meet the mentor teacher requirements of the impending clinical masters certification in Massachusetts. And, fifth, from the teachers' perspective, in particular, programs saw expansion as a way to simultaneously extend their impact and reduce their vulnerability by becoming less marginal to the district. Through growth, programs might develop a community constituency that would argue for program funding during budget hearings, for example.

How did collaboratives go about increasing their size and scope? What opportunities were available to school and college participants? What can we learn from the hard work of these educators? First, we consider issues of expansion within the original sites. Then, we turn to issues associated with expanding beyond the original school, district and college partners.

## Selecting Participants Within the Schools and Colleges

Each of the collaboratives has had to decide which teachers, faculty, and student teachers would participate in the PDS experience. On the one hand, programs that want to increase their size and scope are eager to involve additional faculty and prospective teachers. On the other hand, participants do not believe that all interested individuals will be able to fulfill the new roles to which they aspire. They worry about program quality if involvement is unrestricted and, therefore, have developed criteria and strategies for selecting new participants. Participants are also concerned that new teachers and faculty might be high quality, but not share the PDS philosophy, orientation and goals. Expansion brought with it the need to articulate goals and develop more structured, formalized decision-making processes. This was a new and sometimes stressful experience for many collaboration participants. It required that they evaluate colleagues and determine whether they were appropriately qualified to join the PDS effort.

Schools operate formally as if all teachers were equally capable. There is a strong norm against publicly distinguishing teachers on the basis of the kinds of teaching criteria that would be useful in selecting participants for the PDS's. Therefore, collaborations had to find equitable and comfortable ways of selecting teacher participants that were attentive to quality and philosophical compatibility issues and, at the same time, could overcome the norm against evaluation.

Colleges would face similar difficulties if they wished to establish participation criteria for faculty members; they did not because participation was not yet in demand. Much PDS work had to be done as overload and it was not recognized for promotion decisions. Distinguishing among and selecting student teachers presented the least difficulty. Colleges usually negotiate the match between a students' needs and the opportunities available in the practicum setting and, ultimately, must approve students' placements. This provides college faculty with the flexibility to persuade and dissuade individual students with respect to working in the collaboration.

## Selecting Teachers

Each collaboration developed strategies with which to deal with these crucial and delicate issues. One way was to rely heavily on administrator judgment coupled with multiple opportunities to participate. In this approach, administrators kept fairly tight control of the program, its design, organization and participation. They were likely to have the final word regarding which teachers would work in the most intensive positions, and enable them to have the time to fulfill those roles.

To say that an administrator played a pivotal role in allocating opportunities is not to indicate that decisions were arbitrary or available only to "favorites." On the contrary, faculty members reported that administrators, on the whole, were very committed to identifying people's strengths or potentials, and to try to make it possible for them to contribute. Teacher experience and expertise were reported to be at the heart of administrator decisions. Administrators used the same criteria to shape and sometimes limit the participation of teachers who they felt would weaken the program.

> I think [the principal] ends up being the person who provides these kinds of opportunities for people, but on the whole as I work with him he seems to be very committed to singling out people's strengths or potentials in trying to make it possible for them to contribute according to their strengths and potentials....In the case of the people that I've worked with as cooperating teachers here, it's [been] on the basis of experience and expertise. (Faculty)

A teacher at another PDS site also noted the role of administration in making selection decisions and importance of those decisions:

> [The administrators] talked about a particular individual...and said they didn't feel that he was an adequate enough teacher to take on a student teacher...and they felt that he shouldn't be a cooperating teacher....If other teachers saw that person X could be a cooperating teacher, then they'd think that anybody can be a cooperating teacher.... (Teacher)

Another PDS approach to involving more teachers was to encourage volunteers rather than make selections. The advantages of this approach are inclusiveness and avoidance (at least initially) of difficult choices that might have unpleasant consequences. The disadvantage is the absence of criteria that insure a reasonably good match between the individual's talents and the needs of the program. Mismatches can occur because the collaboration might not do a good job of explaining itself and its key features. Teachers then volunteer without understanding the purpose, form, content, and demands of the PDS. But, even if the explanations are satisfactory, volunteers might not a) fully understand the implications of participation for their daily work, and/or b) be good judges of their ability to implement the PDS program.

Regardless of its process, each PDS collaboration learned that it would have to deal with the consequences of rejecting a teacher who wanted to participate. Programs developed a number of creative approaches for dealing with this problem. Teachers not selected for the most intensive roles might be asked to demonstrate a special lesson or present a workshop or speak at a seminar session, for example. One program that tries diligently to include all teachers in working with student teachers was able, in the past school year, to include all but one of its faculty members. The design of the program -- setting a schedule of important topics early in the year and then finding teachers to demonstrate them -- allows any one of a number of teachers to do demonstration lessons on particular topics or skills. Teachers with considerable responsibility for developing and implementing the program reiterate that they strive to use every teacher at some time and in some way.

> One of the things that's kept this going [is that] everybody's had some type of participation ....nobody feels as though they've been left out. We've all been offered the opportunity to participate. I think that's helped a lot. (Teacher)

To maximize inclusion, programs have even created situations in which two teachers share a student teacher in order to a) include as a cooperating teacher someone who might be suitable and who might also gain from the experience, while b) insuring that the student teacher has a beneficial experience. Occasionally teachers want to present workshops or participate as presenters in seminars, but faculty and other teachers do not think the quality of their work is adequate for these discrete tasks. Even then, those in charge of the PDS seek ways to include such teachers, without making them the centerpiece of a presentation. For example, one teacher might be paired with another teacher for a presentation/workshop and then given only a short period of time for his/her part of the session. Only occasionally has the PDS found it undesirable to enable a teacher to participate at all. Administrators, so far, have found ways to convey this information without serious repercussions.

> I don't know how [the administrator] does it, but he does it. A couple of people have expressed interest and they've been discouraged in one way or another. Not many, though. (Teacher)

The main operating principle, as a planning committee member in one PDS noted, is to "avoid at all costs picking and choosing," among teachers so that some are excluded from participation. Whenever possible, the programs find ways for all teachers to contribute and seek to avoid creating the feelings of comparison and competition. They do not want to create situations in which a teacher can say, "They asked her a few times; they only asked me once. They must think she's a better teacher than I am." Programs have learned to be extremely sensitive to the interpersonal and collegial issues involved in offering opportunities to teachers.

The provision of multiple and varied roles for diverse teachers works well in PDS collaborations that retain the traditional classroom teaching structure. One teacher's work, for the most part, is independent of colleagues' work and the PDS can engage teachers as individuals. However, collaborations based on team teaching, dependent on colleagues and student teachers for the implementation of alternative professional time for teachers on those teams, face a different set of complications associated with expansion. Not only do individual teachers need to be considered, but the quality, interaction and persistence of the entire team must be taken into account in making participation decisions.

During the first phase of program expansion in a PDS based on teams, teachers who wished to join the PDS volunteered, formed teaching teams and were assigned student teachers. Almost immediately, the PDS discovered that learning to work as a team and with a set of student teachers should not be undertaken simultaneously.

> The original team had been teaming for some time. So two things were really critical about that. One is that they already were a team. They worked together well; they had worked out the kinks of scheduling and personality and role responsibilities, and they were really smoothly functioning as a whole group. And the second thing was, they had generated some curriculum packets...that they could hand to the student teachers as a way to begin to think about curriculum planning. And that was very helpful. The problem we ran into with the new teams was they had no experience being a team,...So not only were they trying to understand what the student teacher world was all about, but also they were trying to understand

how to be a group themselves. (Faculty)

According to participants, student teachers complained about sitting in numerous meetings where their time was wasted because everyone was "mucking around trying to figure out what they were doing." Teachers were torn between their obligations to their students, colleagues and student teachers. To prevent this situation from recurring, the PDS Steering Committee developed an application and selection process for new teams that required teams new to the PDS to work together for one academic year prior to involving student teachers.

The experience of this team-based collaboration reveals the importance of allowing (perhaps requiring) each team to establish working relations prior to accepting student teachers. The time teams spend working together enables them to figure out a) why they want to work as a team; b) what pedagogical ideas and goals hold them together as an educational venture focused on children's learning; and, c) what the team expects to contribute to the education of pre-service teachers.

We note the difficulties of expanding teams not to criticize, but rather to point out the multiple demands on participants and the developmental nature of the programs. More teachers wanted to participate, a sure sign of program success. Yet, it became clear that new teachers could not simply "sign on" to the structure. They needed to integrate the ideas and learn new skills as well. They needed to develop competence with their new roles and relationships. Hindsight makes this knowledge available to others who will face similar situations so that they can plan for the gradual transition of teachers into the collaboration.

## The College's Role in Teacher Selection

We have spoken of the administrator's role in selecting teachers and the use of a volunteer strategy that operates with some guidelines and requirements. Both of these approaches to expansion rely heavily on the school site. But colleges have a considerable stake in the choice of cooperating teachers in the PDS. In all teacher education programs, colleges come to value especially some teachers for their capacity to work well with student teachers. The college's desire to select specific individuals can compete with the goals of increasing the numbers of teachers participating and of sharing decision-making with teachers and administrators.

> There are some teachers who we've come to really value as cooperating teachers and as contributing teachers and that's inevitable. So, even in our effort to involve as many people as possible, sometimes we make decisions because we would rather....give a student teacher to [a teacher] who we value rather than someone else who we'd have to work with more, who might not contribute as much. (Faculty)

Some PDS collaborations give colleges the authority to make the final decisions about placements; others have located that responsibility in the steering or management team that includes, but is not dominated by, the college faculty. Depending on the process and structure for selecting teachers and determining individual placements, the college can feel that it has traded autonomy for colleagues who help with important decisions, or that it has lost some measure of control over a key element of its program without gaining much in return.

For example, in some cases, teachers who volunteered to be cooperating teachers did not go through the college's usual screening process, which involves ascertaining whether the cooperating teacher's philosophy is a good match with that of the college. Without such knowledge, the college felt unsure of the appropriateness of the choices made by the PDS until the practicum was well underway. (This issue was more of a concern during the expansion phase of the program than it was during the initial start-up when people who had similar ideas and already knew each other began to collaborate.)

Inappropriate selections can lead to complicated situations in the PDS collaborations. In a traditional program, it is fairly simple for the college to assess whether the placement's inadequacy was due to the particular match of student teacher and teacher, inadequate supervision, or the result of some shortcoming of the cooperating teacher. If it is a problem with the cooperating teacher, the college can decide not to select that individual again.

In the PDS collaborations, such decisions are more complicated. First, the school as well as the college may be involved in selecting and assigning cooperating teachers. The college, therefore, is constrained from acting unilaterally. Second, when there are teams of teachers, excluding one cooperating teacher from work with a student teacher a) interferes with the team's functioning, and b) creates emotional consequences that are likely to be unpleasant. If the team remains together, one member is without a student teacher, complicating interpersonal relationships as well as teaching and alternative professional time work, for example. If the team replaces the individual in order to have a fully functioning team, there may be hurt feelings on the part of all concerned and the new team will need time to learn to work together. The more interconnected the pieces of the PDS, the more difficult will be the decisions about individuals' participation. Participants are working on ways to deal with these sorts of situations; new programs might keep them in mind as they develop their models.

Colleges usually have a significant role in matching individual student teachers with selected cooperating teachers. They generally have a good idea of the strengths and weaknesses of the students and prospective cooperating teachers and take these into account in creating pairs. The PDS selection and assignment process that brings teachers into decision making positions may lead to modifications that reduce or mitigate the college's influence in placement decisions. This does not suggest that placements will suffer, but that the process will expand the number of people who have an influence on the outcomes, changing the traditional role of the college.

## Selecting Student Teachers

Selecting student teachers for the PDS creates fewer organizational dilemmas for the college than does selecting classroom teachers for participation. Colleges usually offer different student teaching options; the PDS can be one more alternative. In addition, colleges do not pretend to themselves that all prospective teachers are equally talented. They tend to identify specific settings and teachers for individual students, taking into account the cooperating teacher's and student teacher's strengths and weaknesses. Sorting students among options, then, is part of the college's normal operating procedure.

What distinguishes the PDS option from others; however, is its purportedly higher educational quality, increased status and potential benefit for future employment options. Virtually all faculty members and teachers associated with the collaborations believe that the level of clinical support that student teachers receive from faculty, teachers and their peers in the PDS is higher than what they receive in traditional placements.

> There's no question in my mind that the level of support that they get in the clinical site is higher, both peer support and support from the schools....On the whole, I feel that I'm doing a better job in the clinical sites. I'm not just dumping people off in the field, hoping that they'll have a good experience. (Faculty)

Because colleges do the initial placement screening; they can be in the position of deciding which students have access to these increased opportunities. This has caused some discomfort and worry on the part of college administrators that they are offering two distinct teacher education tracks.

In the beginning, colleges tended to hand-pick students who were outstanding. Now, each program has expanded the possibility of working in the PDS to a range of students through an application process which involves a) informing students in detail about the program, b) encouraging those who might not volunteer but who the college believes would benefit from the experience, c) choosing from among those who want to participate, and d) assigning student teachers to specific cooperating teachers and/or teams. For the colleges and the public schools, the salient factor influencing selection is the student teacher's ability and interest in working in a more complicated and intense field experience. Colleges agree that not all prospective student teachers want to or could manage the more demanding placements.

> The students in the first year were really hand-picked according to my judgment [but] I solicited input from the [rest of the] faculty so we always ended up with a joint decision. This past semester I invited anyone who was interested to apply....A lot of people selected themselves out because they thought it would be too challenging or too much work. Others because of personal circumstances...One person didn't come, partially at my suggestion....I can't say the groups were always the elite of the student teaching group in any given year, but usually they were. (Faculty)

Collaborations have evolved selection methods over time. One PDS leaves selection to the college. Faculty members discuss the students and make recommendations. In the other collaborations, college faculty, teachers, and administrators work together in elaborate selection processes that include an application, multiple interviews, school visits, and evaluation by the selection committees. One program then individually matches students with cooperating teachers; the other uses a lottery approach that takes into account the students' certification needs. The lottery was developed to avoid what some called a "horse trading" situation in which teachers vied for the strongest student teachers they could find within the available pool of candidates.

### Selecting College Supervisors

In each PDS, student teachers are officially supervised by a representative of the college or university. This supervisor might be a graduate student rather than a faculty member, but the person is invested with official college status and accompanying faculty privileges. Supervisors are assigned to student teachers in the PDS as in traditional placements. They may teach the student teaching seminar taken by students whom they supervise.

The faculty members who began the collaborative endeavors were likely to supervise during the first year of program implementation. Therefore, they understood the program structure and goals, knew the participating classroom teachers, and could provide program specific supervision. As programs expanded, colleges found it difficult to assign supervisors who were already knowledgeable about the PDS. From time to time, faculty have been assigned to supervise PDS student teachers without (they claim) sufficient knowledge of the program and the ways in which it is similar and different from the traditional program.

> I don't have information about this program as a whole. I'm lacking a total picture, a view of what goes on. I only know about my interns.... (College Supervisor)

This has led to varying degrees of frustration for supervisors, cooperating teachers, and student teachers. We noted this issue earlier in discussing program content and coherence.

In some collaborations, classroom teachers have taken on the job of university supervisor in their own PDS. Such an arrangement, needless to say, minimizes the knowledge gap between the school and the college. In one PDS, the supervisor role is built into the teachers' alternative teaching time. A student teacher, sometimes alone and sometimes in collaboration with other team members, works with the children in order to release the cooperating teacher to complete her supervisory work with other student teachers.

In another collaboration, the college routinely hires its own graduate students to supervise student teachers. Several teachers in the PDS are enrolled at the university as graduate students; they are eligible to work as supervisors in the PDS because they are degree candidates who can work as graduate assistants. Their qualifications are identical if not superior to many other graduate students who supervise student teachers.

Although no difficulties have arisen from these arrangements, collaborations need to be aware of potential sources of tension. When classroom teachers serve as college supervisors they gain new knowledge of their colleagues' teaching. There are both benefits and costs to such increased knowledge. Although the long-term benefits -- the opportunities for teachers to learn from one another -- seem worthwhile, collaborations need to consider ways to help teachers in these new roles deal with the short-term difficulties. For example, a student teacher might report to her supervisor that the cooperating teacher is insufficiently attentive or incapable of providing the learning experiences desired by the student. In such a hypothetical situation, the supervisor might determine that it is her colleague, the cooperating teacher, who is not fulfilling her role. Such situations will need to be handled delicately so that the long-term relationship among colleagues remains positive.

Colleges that include PDS and non-PDS student teaching options and, therefore, supervision, need to devote some time to clarifying the requisite knowledge and skill for supervisors at each setting. Longstanding effective preparation for supervisors in the colleges' traditional programs will usually be somewhat inadequate for assignment to the PDS sites. The college coordinator of student teaching supervision might not be the individual to provide training for the PDS site, but that individual needs to be alert to the program demands. The PDS collaborative itself needs to be involved with the selection and integration of faculty new to it.

But the matter of integrating new faculty goes beyond describing the program components and goals; if they are to be successful, the college and school will need to enable newly participating faculty members to become integral parts of the design and growth of the enterprise. They cannot become interchangeable parts as they were in traditional programs. They should not feel like outsiders who merely "work in" the program.

The difficulty, of course, of including the ideas of new faculty, is that they may challenge aspects of the on-going program which has developed over time. Participants will need to develop mechanisms which enable new ideas to be considered, but which do not allow each and every aspect of the program to be re-thought every time a new faculty member joins. This will be a delicate balance to maintain.

## Summary: Expansion, Selection and Participation Issues

Program expansion at all of the sites meant that additional teachers and/or faculty and/or administrators started to participate in enterprises that had been developed collaboratively without them. PDS's have had to figure out how to integrate new members into their on-going operation and how to allow new participants' ideas to have legitimacy within the established collaboration. One of the program components that demonstrates this situation is the team structure: teaching arrangements in which teachers clustered or team taught with one or more student teachers.

In the initial phases of one of the programs, the emphasis was on multi-member teaching teams in which participants shared children and curriculum areas. As the program expanded within and between schools, it became clear that a) not all good teachers wanted to work in teams that were so interdependent; b) not all prospective good teachers would benefit from such an elaborated and complex situation; c) not all schools were organizationally or philosophically amenable to such teams; and, d) there were other ways to define teaming that might be beneficial.

In expanding, the program had to deal with questions of identity, with what could be included in and what fell outside of its borders. Participants asked themselves: If our program is based on teams, can we include as a cooperating teacher a superb teacher who prefers not to team? Is it sufficient if such a teacher consults frequently with colleagues, shares ideas and materials, but prefers to teach alone? Can a team be two (instead of three or four) teachers working together certain times of the day or in certain subjects but not in others? Do they have to share children? Can it be two teachers planning together but teaching independently? The answers to these questions are not trivial; they define the program's philosophy; they set limits on inclusiveness and help to determine criteria for participation.

Participants also have to decide what kind of knowledge to transfer to new sites. Faculty and teachers know that they learned a great deal that could be useful to colleagues in other schools, colleges and districts. They also know that part of the reason for their success and commitment is the home-grown nature of their enterprises. Participants need to separate the content from the process aspect of success in order to determine what might be important for other sites. Thus, there is a tension between wanting to assist others to develop their own versions of PDS's and wanting to help others adopt the models that are already developed and seemingly successful.

Another issue centers on the allocation of scarce, desirable positions. Many teachers may want to teach a college seminar, but only one such position may exist. When there are limited numbers of positions and many teachers who want them, programs have to decide how to fill them. They might consider, for example, the costs and benefits of limiting the duration of the terms of those positions versus allowing the same teachers to fill them indefinitely. The process by which decisions are made about who will be eligible for the positions, as well as the criteria for selection, are also issues with which the PDS sites need to contend.

Furthermore, collaborations are likely to find themselves dealing with limitations placed on teachers as a result of the current organization of their work days. Curriculum coordinators, department chairs or resource room teachers can assume specific roles because they have flexible schedules, often without classroom responsibilities. Especially in schools that are not restructuring the organization of teaching time within the school day, participation in certain roles is limited to teachers who already have flexibility in their work days.

Teachers in one PDS pointed out that it would be extremely difficult for a regular classroom teacher to maintain a classroom and do "all the running around" required in order to get materials and schedules together and meet to organize the weeks ahead. Even if a teacher could do both jobs, it would be impossible to complete them within contract hours. Yet, assigning new roles only to those who already have flexible schedules may be inequitable and create negative feelings among the teachers.

Until this point, we have identified issues that arise when PDS collaborations are expanding and many teachers want to participate. There are times, however, when teachers have felt obliged to participate because of an administrator's keen interest in promoting the program. In one school, teachers describe the PDS as the administrator's "pet project." Because it involves schoolwide curricular as well as pedagogical reforms, teachers feel they have no choice but to adopt the reforms in their classrooms. Some feel more constrained in their options than they did before. This raises questions about the uses and limits of these specific collaborations and their intersection with other aspects of teaching and curriculum reform.

Ideally, one would want the **school** to be the unit of reform with teacher education taking place in the reformed school. Yet, these PDS collaborations often seem to be starting from the other direction: the assumption seems to be that through changes in teacher education practice, the core enterprise of teaching and learning for youngsters will be changed. This may be true; but it asks teachers to buy into a serious role in teacher education when this may not be a) a significant interest, and/or b) they would rather expend their energy on reforming children's education more directly. If the collaboration is grounded in the wrong terrain, some, perhaps many teachers will reject it. Yet, as it grows, they may feel pressure to participate.

Expansion has raised issues for the colleges as well as for the school sites. Colleges learned that their efforts to increase the number of PDS sites raised both interest and concern in neighboring teacher preparation institutions. These concerns centered chiefly on the impact of expansion on the availability of student teaching placements. Some colleges were concerned that they would lose long-established student teaching options if schools joined another college in the PDS effort. As a result of these concerns, the college has entered into discussions with the teacher education programs in the region. They have held joint discussions a) to consider structuring joint seminars and experiences for student teachers from both colleges in the new PDS and b) to determine how many student teachers the school can accommodate without disadvantaging the children.

Collaborations with more than one college now discuss how to integrate the PDS experience in the context of student teaching experiences of different organizations and emphases. One college may have a year-long student teaching experience in one setting while another program prefers two one-semester placements in different schools. They are discussing the content of potential joint seminars that usually accompany student teaching and the issues associated with providing one seminar for students from two different colleges. If a PDS has created such a seminar between one college and the teachers in the PDS, questions arise about the costs and benefits of having student teachers from the second college join the on-going, already developed seminar. The obvious benefit is PDS program coherence. On the other hand, one seminar may blur the genuine distinctions between programs and create financial disincentives for collaboration. College-to-college interactions have grown more complicated as a result of the expansion of the PDS sites. Joining programs together for the purpose of the PDS is possible, but colleges and schools will have to weigh carefully the benefits and liabilities of such multi-school collaborations.

## ISSUES OF ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

When the PDS collaborations began, participants had not been strangers, but neither had they worked in close collaboration. Now, several years later, their relationships are strengthened and broadened. They have developed greater clarity about each others' knowledge and skills and the ways in which each can contribute to the growth of the PDS ventures. They have also developed the organizational and management strategies they need in order to successfully implement their programs. In this section of the report we describe the ways in which the collaborations approached organization and management and we examine some of the issues that they addressed.

### Formal Structural Components

PDS collaborations created organizational structures and processes with which to deal with planning, decision-making, content, expansion, maintenance, implementation, and funding. Organizational structures were necessary for daily functioning. They also served as prods toward institutionalization: toward shifting the programs from their close association with specific individuals to an association with the districts and colleges as organizations.

**The most complex management arrangement** was developed by the most complex program. It includes a steering committee composed of faculty and administrators from two colleges, school district administrators, principals, and teachers. The steering committee deals with the selection of the teaching teams, the recruitment of teachers and students, decisions about which teachers have the opportunity to fulfill different roles and how to make those decisions, financial issues and the nature of collaboration between the colleges and school systems. The steering committee generally meets once a month.

The PDS also sustains a management team, composed of one teacher from each of the teams participating in the schools that are part of the collaboration. The management team deals with issues such as: "what are the expectations of a student teacher and the cooperating teacher?; what's an appropriate time line for involving the student teacher?; when should student teachers be expected to do certain things?; what can you get paid for and what can't you get paid for; and who does the bookkeeping?; and issues of equity in scheduling." (Teacher) The management team developed the structure by which student teachers are selected and placed with teaching teams.

It was not always simple for participants to arrange time for the management meetings, but most found them to be worthwhile despite the difficulties:

> I found it, frankly, very difficult because our school starts at 9:00. I always come in here [to school] at 8:00 to begin preparing for my kids so I was really pulled. I would have to go to those management meetings at 8:00 and at first I found it too much because my student teacher really wasn't ready to take over....As time progressed I realized [the management team meetings were] very worthwhile. I hate to say it, but it was true that the process is what counted, that we learned how to plan and agree, sometimes disagree, but we learned how to build a good strong program....I think teachers have to realize that

> expertise is involved in planning and team building and so on. (Teacher)

Teachers, administrators and faculty through participation on the management team and steering committees work on policy and implementation issues. During the 1989-1990 school year they developed job descriptions for the various roles and responsibilities in the PDS. Their descriptions provided some boundaries for participation while, at the same time, giving individuals the leeway to implement the roles in the ways they preferred. With respect to the role of cooperating teachers, for example, the emphasis was on broad qualifications -- teachers who are growing professionally and who can articulate why they do what they do. In developing a job description for principals, the management team learned that individual principals had radically different ideas of the role they should play in the collaboration.

> Principals expressed everything from a real laissez faire attitude to total involvement. So, we came up with something somewhere in-between [that says] they should certainly be informed about what's going on and should participate...in an informational meeting....We didn't want them involved too much in the actual decisions that we wanted left to the teams, but we certainly wanted them to know what was going on. (Teacher)

The management team and steering committee worked hard to develop a description that balanced the PDS need for clarity with the principals' prerogative to manage in their own styles.

**The least complicated arrangement**, associated with the smallest PDS, was a planning team of the principal, one college faculty member and two teachers who do not have regular classroom assignments. To a considerable extent, the program was developed without the participation of classroom teachers, but with them in mind. In between these two arrangements is a structure that involves a central office administrator, teacher and college faculty member in daily and long-term decision-making.

In addition to the formal structures, there are individuals in each PDS who have informal relations that facilitate project management. For example, the central office administrator in one PDS lobbied a college dean for funds to pay for year-long student teaching assignments and continually presses for changes at the college that would suggest PDS institutionalization. In another PDS the required course prior to student teaching had been offered early in the afternoon. When the PDS developed to the point at which a teacher was going to teach it, and could only teach it after school, conversations at the college led to an agreement to offer the course later in the afternoon to make the collaboration work.

The issue of PDS teachers serving as college supervisors was handled outside of any formal collaboration structure by key individuals working with the college. PDS participants agreed that teachers should serve as supervisors of student teachers, as representatives of the college with the authority to grade their practicum experience. Initially, this arrangement posed problems for the college. To allow classroom teachers such a role is to vest them with the authority of the college when they are not in its employ. It is to ask students to pay tuition to the college for supervision when that supervision is conducted by someone who may be quite competent, but who is not on the payroll of the tuition receiving institution. PDS faculty members dealt with the issue with the result that the college now grants graduate student status and graduate credit to teachers enrolled in a course designed to teach them how to serve as cooperating teachers in the PDS. Since, in the normal course of events graduate students supervise student teachers for the college, this arrangement did not require any change in rules or regulations. Each PDS has individuals who work outside of the management structures to smooth the way for project components, to raise money and to attempt to place the projects on more firm institutional footing.

Although faculty, teachers, and administrators speak proudly of their accomplishments and the ways in which they work together, they also note that the establishment and maintenance of the complicated arrangements are not always easy. Schedules, incentives and time demands vary among and between the institutions. Keeping the lines of communication open is not always easy:

> [Although much of this] has been so constructive, there is also a struggling side where either because of personalities, professional responsibilities and commitments, workloads, or different points of view about things or poor communication, we struggle....[And] there are times when people are asked to contribute when it's not easy to find time and we ask them hoping they will. The times when student teachers will be asked to help out in the school -- because the school has another agenda besides PDS -- in ways they would rather not, or it's a sacrifice to them, or takes away from their main interest....so, there are strains....Sometimes we'll ask teachers to do things assuming they understand the contribution and importance to the program as much as we do, and they don't.... (Faculty)

There may be strains, but these teachers, administrators and faculty members, with little external guidance or previous models from which to work, have developed effective organizational and management strategies. Teachers, in particular, have transformed their own job description and their relationships to colleagues and administrators through participation in the PDS management structures.

## Organizational Issues Involving Time

There is plenty of work for members of the various organizational teams, but too often a shortage of time or insufficient control over the use of available time. Two of the collaborations maintain the traditional school schedule; they have not attempted to change the organization of teachers' work during the school day. As a result, classroom teachers involved in PDS activities that occur during the school day often need coverage. It is specialists who provide that coverage. In these two collaborations, it is also teachers with non-classroom teaching assignments -- curriculum coordinators, special education teachers and administrators -- who have taken on alternative roles that they can fulfill within the normal school day because of their flexible schedules. The third program, through the implementation of team teaching that involves student teachers as full partners, made it possible for teachers to attend management meetings during the school day. Team planning meetings that involve all of the teachers and student teachers, however, often take place on weekends or after school.

Arrangements that enable teachers to devote part of their school time to PDS planning and management activities require a commitment from central office 1) to seek outside funds to pay for coverage, 2) to devote some internal funds to coverage and/or, 3) to support changes in the traditional arrangement of teaching time and personnel during the school day. Central office administrators have been creative in their use of discretionary and outside funding, but this is becoming increasingly difficult in the current economy.

There is no question that participating in the PDS requires a time commitment above and beyond the normal work load, and, time issues are as salient to the college participants as they are to the teachers. By the end of the 1989-1990 academic year, we had spoken to faculty members associated with four colleges working with the three professional development schools. **In all but one, professional development school work required faculty members to commit time above their normal load.** One faculty member reported:

> [this college] as an institution has very little flexibility in terms of workload. Any original project like this, you pretty much take on out of basic commitment and trust. There is not any kind of quid pro quo where you get relief from something else. As the program has developed,...it's been recognized that I need some kind of relief in my workload so my supervision has been lessened. (Faculty)

This individual reports that he is still working an overload, but, "The chance to be part of this [PDS] compensates for the extra work involved."

At one college we heard comments about the need to work overtime in order to fulfill the demands of the program, and the likelihood of needing additional faculty if the PDS's are to continue. At issue is the amount of time faculty need to spend at the school site. Traditionally, teacher education faculty spend little time in schools and so they have sufficient time for their on-campus work. With the advent of PDS, some faculty will necessarily spend more time working in schools. According to faculty involved, in order to sustain PDS work, colleges will have to replace the on-campus time of those faculty members. At this point, there is no certainty that colleges will have either the desire or the resources with which to make such a commitment. The current situation, in which some faculty work extra time to implement these programs will likely continue for the foreseeable future:

> We're all workaholics to some extent, so when there's a project to be done, we do it....[my colleague] probably teaches on overload, but she is also a workaholic....Next semester normally my load is two courses and I'll teach three. It's a stretch. It's not the formal teaching, it's the running back and forth. [Also, there are differences in the calendars.] Our semester is done, [but my colleague] will be teaching even though her contract is over for the year. I'll be going [to the school] the week after next for a meeting. It's good work, and when it's good work, you do it. (Faculty)

This level of individual commitment at the colleges and schools has been essential to program growth and sustenance. Despite the enthusiasm of the participants, however, it is not clear how long collaborations can continue if they require this level of on-going effort. Nor is it clear how long they can continue as special programs that are not integral to either the school or college budget and organization. We turn to several issues that arise from the organizational status of the PDS collaboration in the next section.

## Implications for the Future

What will sustain these programs? On the optimistic side, there is no question that teachers, administrators and faculty members associated with the PDS collaborations are, for the most part eager to maintain and expand them. They are invigorated by their work and see opportunities to further improve the preparation of future teachers and the organization of teachers' work in schools. They have invented new ways of working and want to continue.

Yet, despite the enthusiasm each PDS has engendered, there is little evidence that any of them has the requisite institutional support to insure continuation. In significant ways, each is still dependent on external funding, on juggling existing funds and on the good will of those who determine district and college policies and priorities. Although they might like to be either free-standing, but institutionalized programs, or standard ways of operating within the institutions, none of the collaborations has the authority or power to create that situation. They are, as these two participants note, beholden to others in their respective institutions:

> [You need] an administrator at the school system and people at the university that have decided to put this together, people who are committed, forceful and willing to work like hell. Without the leadership, the whole thing would deteriorate quickly. (Administrator)

> You have to have somebody at or near the top of your hierarchy who's going to be really involved in supporting the program...You need somebody with some leadership and some energy to put into it, some commitment. And I think that has to occur on both the school side and the university side....I honestly think that without that you're going to have a lot of trouble making it work. (Teacher)

## Issues of Funding

Assured funding is essential for PDS continuation, but, for the most part, these three PDS's depend on external, soft money for their operating expenses. Neither the school districts nor the colleges have found ways (or have wanted to find ways) to include PDS costs as parts of their operating budgets. As a result, regardless of their stages of development and complexity, their continuation depends on the ability of the districts and colleges to raise grant money.

Grants have paid teachers for the time they spent developing materials and planning for their work with student teachers:

> If we didn't have the grants we wouldn't have any of the financial rewards. The federal grant has allowed us to say that everyone that goes through training....gets a one-time award of $300.00 as recognition of having completed that [training]....We have summer workshops; if they come and participate they're also paid a stipend for that day....That's also a grant-related kind of thing. (Faculty)

At other times grants provide stipends for the student teachers who have year-long placements. Grant money can also support staff development that teaches participants how to work in teaching and/or management teams. Without the funds, programs would be unable to maintain themselves.

District administrators have found creative ways to make local funds available. For example, one district used the annual allocation for one substitute teacher to fund ten intern stipends. The interns were then available to provide coverage should a teacher be absent. We mentioned earlier that other districts have found ways to reassign staff to enable them to work in the PDS. These arrangements are helpful, but as with grants, the resources are never assured and so funding remains an anxiety provoking aspect of all the PDS collaborations.

## Key Individuals - Not Just Roles

Collaborations worry about the future in light of their tenuous funding situations; they also worry about their dependence on key individuals. Participants would like to know that their PDS would continue even if there were changes at the classroom, school, district, or college. Yet the key players at each of the collaborations doubts that this situation will prevail. Each is aware of his or her centrality to the project.

> You really have to have a lead cheerleader. You have to have somebody at each institution that continuously puts the energy into this....I hope I've transferred ownership....I hope that if I were to leave that what I've done could be institutionalized. I'm not comfortable that that's the case. I still have to make all of the phone calls. I still take the initiative....It still seems to be me doing it and unless you have somebody who's totally committed to that in both places, it's not going to work.... (Administrator)

It isn't only that new leadership would have to learn the ropes; new leadership would have to develop relationships with key actors in the school and college. Such development takes time. One administrator noted about the individual he hopes will replace him:

> He's become part of the program,...he's committed to it, [but] there's just a lot of the program that he just simply isn't familiar with. He's also not tied in academically or administratively to the university, which makes it difficult....I know the Dean. I know all of the people in the area because we've worked together and it makes it very easy for me to pick up the phone and call the Dean....So, the administrative and academic ties to the other institution are important and that takes time. It takes time working on the interpersonal part of the whole thing. (Administrator)

Unless the PDS was already standard operating procedure in the district, it is not clear why a new administrator would choose to devote the time required to this venture rather than to others. In addition, individuals in new positions often need to develop programs that bear their personal stamp. Continuing someone else's pet project, if that is what the PDS's remain, would not likely be in the best interest of such individuals. But because of this situation, some fear that the PDS could suffer the same fate as courses that become identified with particular teachers:

> Courses can die if a teacher stops teaching. Kids will no longer show an interest. We've had many examples of that with elective type courses in this building....So, I would say there's a possibility that if you pulled key people out, this would fizzle. I don't think that's unusual. (Teacher)

There are teachers who believe that they could sustain the programs if key administrators, faculty or teachers were to leave. Their optimism, however, often reveals a lack of understanding of the support work done by the current key participants. It is unlikely that most classroom teachers have either the time, authority, or expertise to fill in for the current crop of key teachers. College faculty note that few, if any, of their colleagues would continue the PDS effort were they to step down. Thus, the likelihood of sustaining PDS's in their current status seems doubtful given the combination of heavy time demands, uncertain continued funding and the need for specific individuals to continue in their roles.

## PDS Programs or Schools

There is one other organizational feature of the PDS collaborations that is likely to influence their capacity to become permanent: their direct connection to the education of children. We left our visits to the PDS sites impressed with participants' enthusiasm and with the amount of thought they have put into the design and implementation of their collaborations. We could easily review many changes in student teachers' experiences and in the opportunities for experienced teachers to work as teacher educators. We also realized that none of the sites, yet, was actually a professional development **school**. Each school had a significant, visible, collaborative pre-service teacher education program operating within it. Many teachers in the schools were heavily involved and invested in the teacher education work. Yet, fundamentally, the schools remain unchanged. Indeed, the most organizationally complex program seemed to be the one that had the **least** school impact. That PDS is a component of the school; the school as a place in which children are educated remains fundamentally the same. In the other two sites, pre-service teacher education and multiple roles for teachers are highly visible to the entire staff. Yet from the perspective of teaching and learning for children, these schools, too, remain unchanged. Why does this seem to be the situation?

Collaborations, for the most part, began with a primary interest in restructuring the field component of teacher education. In one collaboration, teachers had a central concern with restructuring their own work and a secondary interest in changing aspects of children's learning through changes in teaming and in the provision of remedial services. They invented a way to use teacher education to achieve their professional goals. In the other two PDS sites there was no fundamental unrest and dissatisfaction on the part of a group of teachers with regard to the organization of their work. Instead, participant's interest was in improving the field component of teacher education, in new roles for classroom teachers in teacher education, and in administrator access to new teachers. Given the impetus behind the collaborations, it is not surprising that there is little change in schools.

Lack of school impact is not surprising also given that, in general, principals have been omitted from the PDS organizational chart. They were not essential to the enterprise in part because it was not a school reform that would influence children. In the most complex collaboration, they had no role at all in the original design and implementation.

> The role of the principal...isn't, at this point - which is too bad. It is [too bad] to the extent that the principal is part of the school, and....certainly they've heard about the program, welcomed the program in, agreed to have it there. Principals have, to a greater or lesser degree, made some adjustments in scheduling to allow for meetings....I would say, at best, that they are letting it happen, pleased that it's there,...but there's been no attempt on anybody's part to think about the role the principal might play in more fully integrating the student teachers, being part of the student teacher training program in some way, or working more closely with teachers around the teaming....That simply hasn't been built in. (Faculty)

Some principals, with teams that joined the collaboration in the second and third years, were unaware that participating teachers were in their buildings.

The role of other district administrators has likewise not yet been the subject of PDS attention. For example, if teachers do restructure their classrooms and take on roles as curriculum writers as part of their alternative professional time, what involvement should they have with the curriculum specialists in the district? Should anyone need to approve the newly developed curriculum? How autonomous, in other words, can curriculum development become in a PDS? This is an issue that has been raised in one of the districts, but one that has not yet been fully explored:

> Everybody needs different roles and different ways of doing business, and to leave out a resource is foolhardy, I think. I've been very critical of the teams for doing that. There are people who are going ahead and making up science curriculum without ever checking in with the science coordinator who happens to be extraordinary; people doing research on language arts, writing in their classrooms, without having any conversation with a very knowledgeable, skilled, coordinator. There's this disdain for central office that I think is a little neanderthal. There's this movement forward without an understanding still of total organization involvement and what

> that might be. (Administrator)

With multiple program goals in mind, with the need to pay constant attention to funding, and with the limited influence that pre-service teacher education can have given all of the other organizational issues, it is not surprising that schools are not yet restructuring as an outcome of the PDS efforts. It is not surprising that districts are not leaping at the chance to restructure. What is promising, however, is that the presence of the three pioneering PDS collaborations has raised these questions about organization, about roles and responsibilities, and about goals that could lead to more significant changes in the future.

## What Next?

There are people involved with the PDS efforts who wonder what the connection should be between restructuring teachers' roles in teacher education and restructuring schools, as well as whether pre-service teacher education is an appropriate vehicle with which to restructure teaching and learning for children. They ask: why would you expect to see a restructured school that attends to children grow out of a reform that centers on restructuring teacher education? It is a question worth pondering. It might be, as one faculty member suggested, that, in the most rational of worlds:

> Probably, you want to restructure a school, just like you want to restructure a team, **before** you've done pre-service training....It's very difficult for the pre-service people to both attend to their own pre-service growth and development and

> attend to these very difficult issues of restructuring schools at the same time. (Faculty)

The point this faculty member raises is a good one, but the opportunity to make significant change began not with the school but with teacher education. Teacher education is not the core enterprise of elementary and secondary schools. Teacher education neither drives current organization nor the roles that teachers take on in the organization. Although the field experience of teacher education takes place in the schools, it is probably unwise to think that changes in that component would be powerful enough to alter extant practice in many other areas. It may be that these and other PDS collaborations, having come so far, need to pause and consider what they want schools to be like for children, now that they have teachers and faculty thinking together about what they should be like for teacher education purposes.

We make this suggestion with no intention to criticize or sound harsh. The three collaborations that contributed the data for this report are all in the process of defining what professional development schools might be. They have had no external guidelines or criteria for success; they operate with ideas and goals honed out of their accumulated wisdom and with attention focused directly on teacher education. Their evolving models will be three among many. Neither we nor they think that they have arrived at a finished product or that a finished product would be desirable at this time. Our comments, therefore, are meant to encourage further conversation, not to suggest shortcomings.

These three Professional Development Schools face a curious situation as they look to their futures. They have come very far since they began their collaborative ventures almost four years ago. Teachers, administrators and faculty have created considerable change in the preparation of future teachers and in the roles that experienced classroom teachers can play in that process. Faculty, too, have different roles in schools as a result of the collaborations. Several have become more integral to the field experience of student teaching than they ever were in the past. Schools and colleges are more entangled with one another than they have been in the past. We can learn a great deal from their experiences.

Now, they want the new structures and content to become ordinary, to become the way teacher education is done. They want their respective organizations to recognize their achievements by making them part of the mainstream, line item budget. To a great extent, they want to stop being novel programs. Yet, the extent to which collaborations can garner funds seems to depend on the extent to which they can stay in the limelight and propose yet another innovation. In the current economic climate they are unlikely to find a niche in the college or school district budget. And, foundations are less apt to support continuing programs that ought to be part of the school district or college's normal responsibility than they are to support start-up ventures and innovations. To survive, the PDS collaborations need to remain novel as they seek to become normal. This can be disheartening news.

We asked PDS participants at the three sites what advice they would offer to those considering venturing into their own collaborations. After chuckling at the notion of starting such a project given the scarcity of funds, they spoke pragmatically of the time requirements, of the need to learn to work collaboratively, of the importance of local support and of the many benefits that accompany collegial efforts toward a common goal. One faculty member's words are worth repeating to those already invested in the PDS collaborations and worrying about their futures, and to those who are about to begin:

> I would tell them first of all...not to be daunted by what seemed to be practical barriers of constraint. Secondly, I would counsel patience. (Faculty)

Patience is good advice for the teachers, administrators and faculty members involved in creating and sustaining PDS collaborations. It is also sound advice for those who support the projects at the district, university and foundation levels. Too often, practitioners are allowed scant time to implement innovations that might improve the quality of teaching, learning, and learning to teach. Policy-makers and funders seek immediate results because they know that improvements are necessary. But the emphasis on speed can be counterproductive; it often rests on misconceptions about the complexity of the change that is being attempted. PDS collaborations are complicated school, intellectual and intra- and inter-organizational reform projects that need time to develop. Certainly, there must be benchmarks to indicate that development is reasonable and likely to lead to desired outcomes. However, if these three projects and the many others that are emerging in Massachusetts and across the nation are to flourish, we too counsel patience to those who can influence their future.

## REFERENCES

Leading the Way: Report of The Special Commission on the Conditions of Teaching. Massachusetts State Legislature, August, 1987.

Neufeld, B., Haavind, Sarah. Professional Development Schools in Massachusetts: Beginning the Process. Boston: Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning: 1988.

# APPENDIX A: PROGRAM ADDRESSES

## The Calvin Coolidge School/Anna Maria College Professional Development School

Arthur Bergeron
Calvin Coolidge School
May Street
Shrewsbury, MA 01545

Dr. Tom Del Prete
Anna Maria College
Paxton, MA 01612

## East Longmeadow High School and The Academic Disciplines Teacher Education Program of The School of Education at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst

Dr. Peter Cannone, Office of the Superintendent
East Longmeadow Public Schools
180 Maple Street
East Longmeadow, MA 01028

Dr. Helen Schneider, School of Education
University of Massachusetts at Amherst
113 A Furcolo Hall
Amherst, MA 01003

Dr. Earl Seidman, School of Education
University of Massachusetts at Amherst
102 Furcolo Hall
Amherst, MA 01003

## The Learning/Teaching Collaborative: Boston and Brookline Public Schools, Wheelock and Simmons Colleges

Vivian Troen
Edward Devotion School
345 Harvard Street
Brookline, MA 02146

Dr. Katherine Boles
Edward Devotion Street
345 Harvard Street
Brookline, MA 02146

Karen Worth
Wheelock College
200 The Riverway
Boston, MA 02215

# APPENDIX B

## EDUCATION MATTERS, INC.

Education Matters, Inc. is a non-profit research, evaluation and policy analysis group established in 1984. The firm focuses primarily on issues that affect public school teaching and learning, with special concern for students who are served least well by our schools. Education Matters implements studies at the local, state and federal levels, in elementary, secondary and post-secondary institutions. Our purpose is to improve the quality of education by providing useful, timely information to policymakers, program developers, faculty and administrators.

## THE MASSACHUSETTS FIELD CENTER FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

The Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning is a statewide teachers' network established in 1985 to strengthen and improve schools and teaching in the Commonwealth. The Field Center strives to improve teaching and learning by gathering the collective knowledge, experience, concerns and recommendations of teachers and other educators. The Field Center uses this information to inform and guide the creation of educational policy; enhance and refine teachers' professional knowledge and skills; serve as a resource for individuals, schools, institutions of higher education, and policymakers as they consider school improvement initiatives, and promote greater school/college collaboration on teacher education.

Believing that teachers are a valuable resource in making schools better places in which to teach and learn, the Center offers programs and services that draw on teachers' expertise, insights and commitment as instruments of change. Through conferences, forums and publications, the Center promotes and supports the on-going professional development of teachers and provides opportunities for professional collaboration. The Field Center is committed to bringing the voices of teachers - at all stages of professional growth - to the center of discussions about school change and educational policy.

For further information about Center services and programs and to be placed on the mailing list, please contact:

Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning
University of Massachusetts at Boston
Wheatley Hall/Third Floor
Boston, MA 02125-3393
(617) 287-7660

Copies of Professional Development Schools in Massachusetts: Maintenance and Growth are available from the Center.